

**"State of Buddhism in Ceylon
as revealed by
the Pāli Commentaries of the fifth century A.D."**

4
**Thesis submitted for
The Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
of the
University of London
by
H.W. Adikaran.**

June 1933.

ProQuest Number: 10731129

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10731129

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

State of Buddhism in Ceylon
as revealed by
the Pāli Commentaries of the fifth century A.D.

Abstract of the Thesis.

The present work is an attempt to describe the state of Buddhism in Ceylon up to the fifth century A.D. and is based on the Pāli Commentaries of that century. It is divided into two parts.

Part I forms a necessary introduction to Part II. Its first chapter gives a brief survey of the Pāli Commentaries and their authors ; the next two deal with their sources; and the last one with the nature of their contents.

Part II consists of ten chapters. The first gives a short account of the religious conditions in Ceylon prior to the advent of Mahinda. The second deals with the advent of this missionary and the establishment of the Buddhist religion. In the three succeeding chapters it is shown how the faith spread throughout the country, and how the growing influence of the religion was checked from time to time by political and other causes. The growth of dissentient schools forms the contents of the sixth. The seventh chapter is more or less geographical and gives a brief account of the principal centres of Buddhism in Ceylon. Mention is also made here of the various monasteries

that are referred to in the Commentaries. The next two chapters give a survey of Buddhism as a religion of the masses, describing how it affected the life of the people and how various forms of rite and ritual grew and became part of the popular religion. Finally, the attitude of the Ceylonese Buddhist towards the deities both Indian and local is discussed in the tenth chapter.

An effort has been made in the fourth chapter of Part I and in the sixth, ninth and tenth chapters of Part II to estimate how far the Buddhism in Ceylon of the 5th century A.D. differed from the original faith.

Contents.

	Page.
Abbreviations.....	1
Introduction	iv
Part I	
I. The Pāli Commentaries.	1
II. The Sources of the Pāli Commentaries.	22
III. The Bhāṣakas.	52
IV. The Nature of the Contents of the Pāli Commentaries.	71
Part II	
I. Before the Advent of Mahinda	90
II. The Advent of Mahinda.	102
III. The Spread of the Faith.	123
IV. The Writing down of the Texts.	154
V. The First Literary Period.	171
VI. The Growth of Dissident Schools.	188
VII. Where the Faith Flourished.	218
VIII. The Buddhist Life.	268
IX. The Growth of Ritual.	287
X. The Position of the Deities.	311
Appendix I	353
Appendix II.	360
Appendix III.	378
Bibliography.	381

Abbreviations.

A	Anguttaranikāya	
ApA	Apadāna Atthakathā	
Att	Atthasālinī	
Bgh	Buddhaghosa (The Life and Works of) by B.C.Law	
Bu	Buddhavamsa	
BuA	Buddhavamsa Atthakathā	
GpA	Gariyāpitaka	..
Ohl	Ollavamsa	
Ohl.tr.	Ollavamsa Translation by W.Geiger	
D	Dighanikāya	
D & M	Dipavamsa and Mahāvamsa (English Translation)	
		by E.Geiger	
DhA	Dhammapada Atthakathā	
Dip	Dipavamsa	
Ep. Zey.	Epigraphia Zeylanica	
I.H.Q.	Indian Historical Quarterly	
ItA	Itivuttaka Atthakathā	
J	Jātaka	.. (Faustöhl's Edition)
J.P.T.S.	Journal of the Pāli Text Society	
J.R.A.S.	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society	
J.R.A.S.(C.B.) (Ceylon Branch)
Kv	Kavāvivaranī	
M	Majjhimanikāya	

Mn	Manorathapūraṇī	
Mn Sn	,,	(Sinhalese Edition)
Ml	Milindapaṭṭha	
MNIA	Mahaniddesa Aṭṭhakathā	
Mv	Mahāvamsa	
Mv.tr.	Mahāvamsa Translation by H. Geiger	
NA	Netti Aṭṭhakathā	
Pap	Papañcasūdanī	
Pap Sn	,,	(Sinhalese Edition)
Pj	Parameṭṭhajaṭṭhikā	
P.L.C.	Pāli Literature of Ceylon by E. F. Malalasekera	
P.P.	Path of Purity	
PmaA	Paṭisaṃbhidāsaṃgga Aṭṭhakathā	
P.T.S.	Pāli Text Society	
Pug.Pari.Com.	Puggalapaṇṇatti Commentary	
PvA	Petavatthū Aṭṭhakathā	
R.A.S.	Royal Asiatic Society	
S	Samyuttanikāya	
SA	,,	Aṭṭhakathā (Sāratthappakasini)
SA Sn	,,	,, (Sinhalese Edition)
Sap	Saṃantaṭṭhāsinī	
Sap Sn	,,	(Sinhalese Edition)
Sum Vil	Sumaṅgalavilāsinī	

SV	Sammohavinodani
Thera A	Theragāthā Atthakathā
Theri A	Therīgāthā ..
Udā	Udāna ..
Vi	Viṇṇāhiraṇṇa
Vvā	Vimānavatthu Atthakathā

Introduction.

The history of Buddhism in Ceylon is still an almost unexplored field. As far as the ancient period is concerned our knowledge has been limited to what can be gleaned from the Dipavamsa and the Mahāvamsa. A wealth of information^t lies scattered in the Pāli Aṭṭhakathās or Commentaries of the fifth century A.D., and the present work is an attempt to link together that scattered material and reconstruct the history of Buddhism in the island upto that century.

The Aṭṭhakathā references to incidents which took place in Ceylon were not intended to serve as records of history. Their only use to the commentators was as illustrations in the elucidation of the Canonical Texts. Such being the case, these references are not to be found in chronological or any other order. Not seldom has one to read scores of pages in a Commentary before one comes across a reference to a person or place or event connected with Ceylon. Often even when such references are obtained it is exceedingly difficult to find out to what periods in the history of Ceylon the events thus referred to belong. For instance, there are over a hundred references in all to about twenty theras who lived in the time of King Dutthagāmaṇi. Taking the references to each thera separately one cannot possibly say

that the theras lived during the reign of that king. Fortunately, in one place we find one of these theras mentioned as a contemporary of another, who, in turn, is said in another reference to be the contemporary of a third there, and so on; and further some of them are said to have received a gift from or else had some other connection with the king in question. Thus it becomes possible to establish the fact that all these theras were contemporaries of that monarch. This, in general, is the method of the linking together of references adopted throughout this work. The Mahāvamsa and the Dipavamsa, too, become of very great use in this direction.

There is, still, a considerable number of references ~~which~~ which, with our present knowledge of Ceylon history, are difficult to be treated chronologically. Most of these have, therefore, been grouped according to the localities mentioned in them and form the contents of a separate chapter (Part II ch.7) which is more or less of a geographical nature. With the discovery and publication of further inscriptions, it may become possible to know more definitely about the places mentioned in this group of references.

With the exception of these, the rest of the available material has been utilised to give, as far as possible, a connected history of the faith from the earliest times down to the fifth century A.D. ^{As} as a rule, facts given in detail in

the Mahāvamsa have been left out entirely or are mentioned only incidentally. Recourse had to be taken to this method of treatment, as the purpose of the present work is to give a history of the faith as revealed by the Pāli Commentaries.

The work is divided into two parts. Part I forms a necessary introduction to Part II, and deals with the Pāli Commentaries, their sources and the nature of their contents.

Part II, consisting of ten chapters, is devoted to a consideration of the introduction of Buddhism to Ceylon, its spread there and the effects which the faith had upon the life of the inhabitants of the island. Considerable attention is paid, especially in the chapters on the "Dissentient Schools" and the "Growth of Ritual" - and also in the fourth chapter of Part I - to the development (or corruption) which the faith underwent in its new home. As a possible aid to further research on the subject, an alphabetical index of names of persons and places in Ceylon as found in the Commentaries is inserted as an Appendix.

As far as available the Aṭṭhakathās used are the publications of the Pāli Text Society, London. For the rest I have used those published in Ceylon in Sinhalese characters. Even when a translation of a Commentary is available in English I have, in order to be more precise, often preferred the original Pāli.

PART I

CHAPTER. I

The Pali Commentaries.

The Pali Atthakathās or Commentaries form the main source of material for our attempt to reconstruct the history of Buddhism in early Ceylon. The light they throw on every aspect of the Buddhist life at that period is invaluable. Hence it is necessary to give at the very outset, at least a brief survey of the works themselves, their authors, the sources from which they were drawn, and the nature of their contents. In the present chapter we shall deal with the first two points.

The following table gives a list of the Commentaries, the Canonical Texts on which they are written, and their authors :

Text	Commentary	Author of Comm:
	<u>Vissuddhimagga</u>	<u>Buddhaghosa.</u>
<u>Vinaya</u>		
Vinaya Pitaka	Sumanatapāsādikā	..
Pāṭiśokkha	Kaṅkṣāvitaranī	..
<u>Sutta</u>		
Dīghanikāya	Sumangalavilāsinī	..
Majjhimanikāya	Papañcasūdanī	..
Saṃyuttanikāya	Sāratthappakāsinī	..
Anguttaranikāya	Manorathapūraṇī	..

<u>Text</u>	<u>Commentary</u>	<u>Author of Comm.</u>
<u>Sutta (continued)</u>		
<u>Khuddakanikāya</u>		
(1) Khuddakapāṭha	Paramatthajōtika	Attributed to Buddhaghosa
(2) Dhammapada	Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā	..
(3) Udāna	Paramatthadīpanī	Dhammapāla
(4) Itivuttaka	Paramatthadīpanī	..
(5) Suttanipāṭa	Paramatthajōtika	Attributed to Buddhaghosa
(6) Vināyavāṭṭhu	Paramatthadīpanī	Dhammapāla
(7) Petavāṭṭhu	Paramatthadīpanī	..
(8) Theragāthā	Paramatthadīpanī	..
(9) Therīgāthā	Paramatthadīpanī	..
(10) Jātaka	Jātakatthakathā	Attributed to Buddhaghosa
(11) Niddesa	Saddhammapajjōtika	Upasena
(12) Patisaṃbhidā- maṇi	Saddhammappakasini	Mahānāma
(13) Apadāna	Vissuddhajānavilasini	Not known
(14) Buddhavaṃsa	Naddhuratthavilasini	Buddhadatta
(15) Cariyāpiṭaka	Dhammapāla Paramatthadīpanī	Dhammapāla
<u>Abhidhamma</u>		
Dhammasaṅgani	Atthasaṅgini	Buddhaghosa
Vibhaṅga	Sammutthavinodani	..
Kathāvatthu Puggalapamāṇi Dhātukathā Yamaka Paṭṭhāna	Pañcappakaraṇapatt- hāna	..

This list shows that more than half of the works are by Buddhaghosa. He was, indeed, the greatest Buddhist commentator and, quite naturally, many are the legends that have grown round his life. In Ceylon there exists up to the present day a popular tradition that he was born in this world for the sole purpose of writing the Pali Commentaries and thereby of helping the parivatti sāṃsa or the 'teaching in doctrine' of the Buddha to be preserved in all its purity for a long time.

The Mahāvamsa¹ gives a wealth of information about this great personage. The Buddhaghosuppatti², too, gives a very long account of his life, but considered from a historical point of view, it is unfortunately not of much value. "The Life and Works of Buddhaghosa"³ by B.C. Law and the fifth chapter of Malalasekara's "Pali Literature of Ceylon"⁴ may be cited as the most valuable among the recent works on the subject. These deal exhaustively with the activities of the great commentator and we need not repeat here what has already been stated in them.

The validity of the inferences of Law as to

1. Ch. 37. vv 215 - 246.

2. Edited and translated by J. Gray, published by Luzac & Co. 1892. See also P.L.C. pp 79 foll.

3. Published by Thacker, Spink & Co, Calcutta, 1923.

4. Published by the Royal Asiatic Society, London, 1928.

Buddhaghosa's proficiency in Brāhmanical learning¹ is, ~~however~~ however, in my opinion, open to doubt. I see no ground to justify his statement : "It was Buddhaghosa who developed and perfected the Buddhist system of thought."² He is far more correct in his observation : "It is difficult, nay impossible, to find out with any exactitude, what was his personal contribution to the ancient stock of knowledge, but whatever that may have been, we have to be grateful to Thera Buddhaghosa whose labours have simplified much of what was complex and rendered intelligible what was abstruse and vague."² The mere fact that Buddhaghosa mentions in his Commentaries the names of the four Vedas or that he describes this or that Vedic sacrifice does not entitle us to conclude that he was pre-proficient in Brāhmanic lore, any more than, as we shall shortly see, certain obviously incorrect derivations of words and chronological inaccuracies seen in his works entitle us to infer that he was ignorant of the Sans[^]crit language and of history.

Buddhaghosa's task was not to write a series of original books on Buddhism but to put into Pali in a coherent and intelligent form the matter that already existed in the various Sinhalese Commentaries. His method of work is described by himself in the introduction to the Samantapāsādikā : "In commencing this commentary - having embodied therein the Mahā-

1. Sgh. pp. 12 foll.

2. Ibid. p. 157.

Aṭṭhakathā, without excluding any proper meaning from the decisions contained in the Mahā-paccarī, as also in the famous *Surudi* and other commentaries, and including the opinions of the Elders From these commentaries, after casting off the language, condensing detailed accounts, including authoritative decisions, without overstepping any Pāli idiom (I shall proceed to compose my work):¹

Buddhagosa had before him copies of all the different Sinhalese Commentaries and also the Canonical Texts. In translating an Aṭṭhakathā from Sinhalese into Pāli he frequently consulted the corresponding Canonical Text. An illustration from the *Buddhavalāsi* will make this point clear. Having given the etymological explanation of the word *ṭṭha* *ṭṭha*-*padosika*, he mentions that there is also a variant reading *ṭṭha*-*padusika* in the text; and at the same time he observes that the latter form is not found in the Commentary? Instances- Instances of this nature are very frequent in Buddhagosa's works. While on the one hand, these are an index to the scholarly way in which the great commentator performed his task, on the other, they show that in his time the various recensions differed from one another only very slightly. The phrase *sabbe aṭṭhakathāsu vuttam* (= mentioned in all the Commentaries) is also of frequent occurrence,² and is proof

1. P.L.C. pp. 93, 94.
3. See e.g. Kv. 176.

2. Sum VII I 113. 3. e.g. see

for us that Buddhaghosa had before him and that he referred to all the Sinhalese Commentaries.

Whenever Buddhaghosa has to give his own views on any point, compelled to do so by the absence of any explanation elucidating it in the Sinhalese Commentaries, he does not fail to mention that the views are his own (ayaṃ naṃ me attano mātī)¹. The diligence and precision which Buddhaghosa has thus shown in his works may not appear to be anything remarkable when compared with the scientific accuracy of the present day scholar. But it must not be forgotten that he lived fifteen hundred years ago, and it is only as we take this into consideration and compare him with scholars of other civilized countries of the same day that a true estimate of him becomes possible.

As mentioned before there are several etymological errors in the works of Buddhaghosa. For example the word dosina in dosina mātī (=moonlight night) is defined as dosānaratā (= free from stains)². Dosina is clearly the Pāli form of the Sanskrit jyotana (=moonlight), and therefore cannot have the meaning assigned to it here. Again Makkhali, the name of a well known ascetic in the days of the Buddha, is derived from mā khali (=do not stumble)³, whereas the correct name of the philosopher seems to have been Mackarin. 'The term Mackarin is explained by Pāṇini

1. 1.

1. Pap I 28.

2. SumVil I 141.

3. Man II 28, SumVil I 143, 144.

as meaning one who carries a bamboo staff (maskara)
 "According to Patañjali's comments the name indicates a
 school of Bandarera or Sophists who were called maskarins not
 so much because they carried a bamboo staff about them as
 because they denied the freedom of the will. ¹

On the other hand in some parts of the Com-
 mentaries we have clear evidence of the knowledge of Sanskrit
 grammar possessed by those who were responsible for their
 compilation. The Visuddhimagga explains Indriyattho as "Inda-
 liyattho indriyattho, indadevitattho indriyattho, inda-
 ditthattho indriyattho, indasitthatttho indriyattho, indajutth-
 attho indriyattho." This explanation, as Arinath De points
 out, is evidently a reminiscence of the Pāṇinī Sūtra (V.2,93)
 "Indriyam indralingam indradṛṣṭam indradarṣṭam indrajṣṭam
 indradattam iti vā" ²

Further we have an apparent chronological error
 in the Samantapāsādikā, in which Buddhaghosa gives a list of
 the teachers who handed down the Vinaya from the time of
 Mahinda 'up to the present day' (yāvaḥ jatana) ³. But no there

1. See H.N. Barua : A History of Pre-Buddhist Indian Philosophy.
 pp.298,299. It is interesting to note that the error with
 regard to this word is found not only in the Pāli Commentaries
 of Ceylon but also in Jain records whose authors being Indians
 ought to have known better the correct meaning of the term.
 According to them the philosopher was called ankhali because
 his father was a bankha, that is, a dealer in pictures. As
 Barua observes a certain amount of mystery hangs round the
 name and life of this teacher. Opus.cit. p.298.

2. J.P.T.S. 1906-1907 p.172 . For similar Sanskrit influences
 see also Pj I. 17,214,215.

3. Sep I 62.

in the list belongs, as will be shown in a later chapter, to a period after the first century ^{A.D.} ~~B.C.~~, whereas Buddhaghosa wrote his Commentaries in the early part of the fifth century A.D. The problem involved in this seeming chronological error as well as in what ^{was} ~~are~~ pointed out immediately before, namely, the ignorance of Sanskrit exhibited in some parts of the Pali Commentaries and the knowledge of the same in other parts, cannot be satisfactorily explained if we are to assume that Buddhaghosa used a free hand in the Commentaries. But the problem becomes easy of solution if we take the ^{view} ~~that~~ that the Sinhalese Commentaries grew in course of time receiving additions at the hands of Sinhalese teachers some of whom were conversant with the Sanskrit language and some not, and that the task of Buddhaghosa as editor and translator was not to rectify the expositions embodied in the Commentaries that were before him, but to rearrange them, to summarize them where necessary and to turn them into the Pali language. Rhys Davids has summed up in a few words all that could be said now of Buddhaghosa : 'Of his talent there can be no doubt ; it was equalled only by his extraordinary industry. But of originality, of independent thought, there is at present no evidence.' ¹

The Visuddhimagga was the first work of Buddhaghosa in Buddhaghosa in Ceylon. The Mahāvamsa tells us

¹ Hasing's Ency. of Rel. and Ethics Vol. II. p. 887.

that he wrote it in brief 'summing up the three Piṭakas together with the Commentary.'¹ According to the same authority it was written as an exposition of two verses given him by the Mahavihāra community in order to test his abilities prior to entrusting him with the weighty and responsible task of translating the Sinhalese Commentaries into Pāli.²

The Visuddhimagga is a concise but complete encyclopædia of the Buddhist teachings. In the words of Mrs Rhys Davids 'of this extraordinary book we might say, within limits, what is said of the Divine Comædia and of the Shakespearean plays : in its pages may be found something on everything - i.e., in the earlier Buddhist literature.'³ Throughout the work Buddhaghosa draws material from and quotes from practically all the Canonical Texts as well as some post-Canonical works such as the ^PJetakopadesa, Milindapaṭṭha and the Anāgata-vamsa.⁴ Frequent reference is also made to the Sinhalese Atthakathās and to the works classed as the Poraṇā (the Ancients) with the latter we shall deal in the next chapter. The Visuddhimagga, in turn, is quoted in Buddhaghosa's own, but later, works and also in several other Commentaries.⁵

Some scholars are inclined to think that Buddhaghosa borrowed his material for the Visuddhimagga from the

1. Mv. 37.235 2. Ib. 14.57.235. 3. Afterword to Visuddhimagga P.T.S. Edition p.763. 4. See Mrs Rhys Davids Index to Vi. pp Vi. pp 753-761. 5. See eg. Manu 696, 709. EV 57, 331. Att 183, 186 Uda 24, 256, 268, 283. Pma 74, 435. Pj II 246, 248, 249. Pj II(2) 444

Vimuttinagga, a Pāli work of which the author was a therā by the name of Upatissa and which was translated into Chinese in 505 A.D. Malalasekara strongly refutes this view put forward by M.Nagai in an article contributed to the Journal of Pāli Text Society and, while maintaining the extreme improbability of the Visuddhinagga being modelled after the fashion of the Vimuttinagga, concludes that they might have been written by men belonging to much the same school of thought.¹ Further light has been thrown on the subject by Nyanatiloka by pointing out a passage in the Commentary to the Visuddhinagga. Here its author, Champapāla, commenting on a statement made by Buddhaghosa in his Visuddhinagga, mentions the Vimuttinagga as well as Upatissa.² It is possible that a closer connection between the two works may be discovered, but in the present state of our knowledge it is premature to arrive at any conclusions concerning the influence of the one book on the other.³

With regard to the other works of Buddhaghosa we are not in a position to place them in any definite chronological order. In almost all the books there are references to one or other of the commentator's other works,⁴ but they afford us no else certain clue. This is due to the fact that a book wherein reference is made to another is itself referred

1. P.L.C. 86-88. 2. Nyanatiloka: German Translation of the Visuddhinagga, Munich, 1931. Foreword pp. 4, 5. 3. For further details on the Visuddhinagga see P.L.C. 84-88, Lgh 70-74, and Afterword to Visuddhinagga P.T.S. Edn. 4. E.g. SV is mentioned in Pap II 30, SA II 45; Att in SV 43, 396, 410, 479. In these Att. is referred to as the Dhammasaṅgahatthakathā.

to in that other. For instance, in the Atthasālinī the reader is asked to refer for some details to the Samantapāsādikā.¹ This may lead us to infer that the Atthasālinī was the later work, but such easy conclusion becomes unwarranted when we find the reader of the Samantapāsādikā referred to the Atthasālinī for a like purpose.² Without, therefore, attempting the task, which does not seem to be possible with our present knowledge of the facts, of placing the books in chronological sequence, we shall deal with them in the order : Vinaya, Sutta and Abhidhamma.

Samanta-
pāsādikā.

Samantapāsādikā is the Commentary on the Vinaya. It is a voluminous work written at the request of the thera Buddhāsiri.³ The epilogue to the book gives a good deal of valuable information, according to which Buddhaghosa learned the Sinhalese Commentaries from another thera by the name of Buddhānitta. At this time Buddhaghosa was residing at Anuredhapura in the building erected to the east of the Mahavihāra by the minister Mahanigama. The writing of the Commentary was begun in the twentieth year and completed in the twenty-first year of king Sirinivāsa, that is, of king Mahanāma of the Mahavamsa.⁴ As this king

1. Att 97. 2. Sup. I 150. 3. Iaw says that Buddhaghosa apologises for undertaking to write, first of all, a Commentary on the Vinaya Piṭaka, contrary to the usual order of Dhamma and Vinaya. (Bgh. p. 77). Malalasekara, too, mentions that Buddhaghosa says he wrote it before all others because the Vinaya forms the foundation of the Buddhist faith. As authority for this statement Malalasekara quotes Sup. I p. 1 v. 5. But I am unable to find this in the original text. See B. P. C. p. 16 other verse in the prologue or the epilogue to the Samantapāsādikā. 4. Sup. 8n I 427. 5. For the identity see P. C. C. p. 96

reigned for twenty two years (from ^{427 - 431} ~~398 - 426~~ A.D.), we may infer that the Samantapāsādikā was written in the year ^{429 - 430} ~~418 - 419~~ A.D.

This period seems to have been a troublous one in the political history of Ceylon as is evidenced by Buddhaghosa's expression of joy at being able to complete his work in one year in safety, in a world overwhelmed with dangers.¹ The Mahāvamsa tells us that the death of Mahanama was followed ^{that} by serious political upheaval and hardly two years had elapsed since the king's death when Anurādhapura was overrun by Tamil invaders who ravaged the country, hindered its progress and menaced its religion. As it was usual in times of trouble the defenders of the faith fled to Rohana and it took more than a quarter of a century before the Sinhalese regained their freedom and before their religion was again established as in earlier times.² In my opinion this was the chief reason that compelled Buddhaghosa to leave Ceylon before he could complete the writing of all Commentaries to all the Texts of the Three-three Pitakas.

Kankha-
vitarani

Besides the Samantapāsādikā Buddhaghosa wrote another Commentary, the Kankhavitarani or Kāṭikāṭṭhakathā on a portion of the Vinaya, namely the Pātimokkhaṃ. This was based on the tradition of the Mahāvihāra and was written at the request of a therā named Sona.³

¹ Pūj. Pa. II 427.
² Mv. 33.vv 1 - 37.

³ Kv. 1.

Commentaries
on the four
principal
Nikāyas.

Then come the Commentaries on the four principal Nikāyas in succession : the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* on the *Dīgha*, the *Papañcasūdanī* on the *Majjhima*, the *Sāratthappakāsinī* on the *Saṃyutta* and the *Manorathapurāṇī* on the *Aṅguttara*. The first of these was written at the request of the thera *Dāṭṭhika* of the *Sumaṅgala Parivasa*¹. Perhaps it was the name of this *Parivasa* that suggested to *Buddhaghosa* the title *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* for his Commentary. The *Papañcasūdanī* was written at the instigation of the thera *Buddhamitta*, a friend of our commentator with whom he lived at *Mayura Paṭṭana*². A thera called *Jotipāla* is mentioned as having requested *Buddhaghosa* to write the *Sāratthappakāsinī*.³ Probably he is the same as the *Jotipāla* mentioned in the epilogue to the *Manorathapurāṇī* as having been a co-resident of *Buddhaghosa* when the latter was at *Kaṇṇipura*⁴. In the prologue to each of these books it is said that these are translations into Pāli of the original Sinhalese Commentaries brought to Ceylon by *Mahinda* and preserved there by the dwellers of the *Mahāvihāra*. Moreover in the concluding verses it is said that the Pāli versions are written incorporating the essence (*saṃkṣepa*) of the Sinhalese *Mahā-atthakathā*.

1. *Sum* VII. *Kevavitarana* Edn. p. 780. 2. *Paṇ* Sn 1029.
3. *SA* Sn III 235. 4. *Man* Sn 854, 855.

It may also be interesting to note that more than half the number of incidents referring to Ceylon mentioned in the *Manorathapūraṇī* are connected with the province of Rohana, from which it may, perhaps be inferred that the Sinhalese Commentary on the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* received its final form in that province.

Buddhaghosa is also said to have written the Commentaries on four books belonging to the *Khuddaka Nikāya*, namely, *Dhammapadam*, *Jātaka*, *Khuddakapāṭha* and *Suttanipāṭa*.

The *Dhammapadatthakathā*, too, according to its introductory verses, is the Pāli translation of an original Sinhalese Commentary, and the translation was made at the request of a thera named Kumārakassapa.¹ Many scholars hold

the view that the *Dhammapadatthakathā* is not a work of the great commentator Buddhaghosa.²

Geiger is of opinion that it is later than the

Jātaka collection. A stanza at the end of the book tells us that at the time of writing the *Dhammapadatthakathā* the author was living in a residence built by king Sirinudda.³ As Malalasekera points out Sirinudda is apparently only another name for Sirinivāsa (*Mahanāma*).⁴ This brings us to the date of Buddhaghosa. There is, it is true, a difference in language and style between the *Dhammapadatthakathā* and the other Commentaries which belong to Buddhaghosa. But this should

1. DhA I 1. 2. P.L.C. 95 - 96. 3. Pāli Literatur und Sprache p. 22. 4. DhA IV. 235. 5. P.L.C. 96.

not be taken as the only criterion, for 'this difference may possibly be due to the difference in the subject matter of the various texts taken up for comment'.¹

Various scholars have also expressed their doubt as to the authenticity of the tradition that ascribes the Jātakatthakathā to Buddhaghosa. This question is dealt with

Jātakatthakathā fully by Malalasekara in his Pali Literature
-kathā. of Ceylon.² The Commentary is written ~~in~~ ^{was}

in Pali at the request of three theras Atthadassi, Buddhavitta and Buddhadeva. The last thera mentioned belonged to the Mahānāsaka sect but the work is based on the Mahāvihāra recension of the Jātaka collection.³ From this we may justly infer that at least as far as the interpretation of the Jātakas was concerned there existed at this period no antagonistic ~~sent~~ feelings between the Theravāda and the Mahānāsaka sects.

The Commentaries on the Khuddakapāṭha and the Suttanipata are both called by the same name Paramatthajotikā and are attributed to Buddhaghosa. How far this
Paramatthajotikā tradition is authentic we shall now try to
-jotikā. investigate.

Buddhaghosa's works, about the authorship of which we have no doubt, are written at the request of some

1.P.L.C. 97 2.Ibid. 123-125 See also Geiger: Pali Literature
und Sprache p.20 3.J.I.1.

there or other, whereas no such request is mentioned in these two Commentaries. The patthana verses (those expressing the author's aspiration), too, of the Khuddakapāṭha and the Suttanipāṭa Commentaries, though the one set is identical with the other, are different from those in other works¹. It is also significant that neither of these two Commentaries is said to be based on the records of the Mahāvihāra fraternity, a fact which Buddhaghosa never fails to mention. These considerations make one doubtful as to the authenticity of the tradition, but are in themselves not sufficient to disprove it.

^S But something more definite can be said of the Khuddakapāṭha Commentary. In the opening verses, the author expresses how difficult it is for a person such as himself, not understanding the Doctrine, to write a Commentary on the Khuddakas.

(Khuddakāṇaṃ gambhīrattā kiñcāpi atī dukkarā

Vannanā mādiseṇ'esaṃ abodhantena sāsanaṃ.)

However, as the decisions of the ancient teachers (pubbācariya-vinicchaya) exist up to his day he summons up courage to attempt the task. Such an admission of weakness Buddhaghosa has never recorded in any other work. It is, indeed, unlikely that Buddhaghosa who was capable of compiling a work such as the Visuddhimagga would offer such an apology. Moreover, a good deal of the material in this Commentary appears to be

1. Compare Pj I 253 and Pj II(2) 608 with Vi II 712, 713 or SV 523, 524.

taken almost direct from the Visuddhimagga and the Samantapāsādikā¹. At the end of the book there appears the usual passage, which is found at the end of all works of Buddhaghosa, containing an eulogy of himself, in which he is described as a person 'possessing unrivalled knowledge in the teachings of the Buddha including the three Piṭakas and the Aṭṭhakathās' (-tipit (tipitakapariyattippabhede aṭṭhakathe satthusāsane appatthata- ñāpappabhāvena)² How incompatible this is with the introductory verses referred to above !

The peculiar style of this Commentary is also worthy of notice. While commenting on the RatanaSutta the author states that some teachers held the view that the whole of the Sutta was uttered by the Buddha whereas others held that only the first five were uttered by him. The author then proceeds to say "Let this be so or otherwise. Of what use is this investigation to us ? We shall comment on the whole of this Ratana Sutta."³ An attitude such as this is, indeed, foreign to Buddhaghosa.

Taking into consideration all these facts we may with justification infer that this Commentary is not a work of Buddhaghosa and that the colophon was added at a time when traditional belief was in favour of attributing it to him. It is also possible that its true author was another Buddhaghosa.

1. Compare Pj I 37-75 with Vi 239-266
 ,, 107-109 ,, ,, 209-212
 ,, 89-98 ,, Snp I 4-16

2. Pj I 253.

3. Ibid. I. 165.

Perhaps he was the Buddhaghosa who requested the great commentator to write the *Atthasālinī* and the *Samacharavinodanī*.¹

Further, in spite of the few resemblances that were pointed out earlier, between the Commentaries on the *Khuddakapāṭha* and the *Suttanipāta*, the following reasons make it very unlikely that they were compilations of the same authors:

(1) Full comments are made on the *Ratana*², *Maṅgala*³ and *Metta*⁴ Suttas in both books. This repetition would have been unnecessary if the same person wrote both.

(2) In the *Suttanipāta* Commentary the reader is referred to the *Vissuddhimagga* for certain details of the '*duṭṭhigāṇa*'.⁵ but these are given in full in the Commentary on the *Khuddakapāṭha*.⁶ If the authors were identical we should have expected the same brief treatment in the latter case also.

(3) Similarly in the *Suttanipāta* *Atthakatha* reference is made to the *Papañcasūdanī* with regard to the explanation of the phrase '*evaṃ sa sūta*'.⁷ whereas it is given in detail in the *Khuddakapāṭha* *Atthakatha*.⁸

Commentaries on
the Abhidhamma.

The Commentaries on the seven
Texts belonging to the Abhidhamma
Piṭaka were written by Buddhaghosa

1. Att 1; SV 523. 2. Pj I 157 foll, Pj II 238. 3. Pj I 88foll.
Pj II 300 4. Pj I 231foll, Pj II 193. 5. Pj II 248, 249.
6. Pj I 37 foll. 7. Pj II 300. 8. Pj I 100foll.

at the request of another there of the same name,¹ and are based on the original Sinhalese Commentaries as well as on the accepted interpretations of the Mahavihara.² They consist of three books, namely, the Atthasālinī³ on the Dhammasaṅgani, the Sammohavinodani on the Vibhaṅga, and the Pañcappakaraṇapāṭṭhakathā on the remaining five Texts: Kathavatthu, Puggalapāṭṭatti, Dhātukathā, Yamaka and Paṭṭhāna. The Sammohavinodani contains much information regarding the state of Buddhism in early Ceylon and is perhaps the most valuable of the Pāli Commentaries in that respect.

Buddhaghosa's
Successors.

The task of writing the Atthakathās which were left untranslated into Pāli by Buddhaghosa was accomplished by Buddhadatta, Dhammapala, Upasena, Mahānāma and another there whose name is now lost to us. These Commentaries are, unfortunately, far less useful than those of Buddhaghosa when considered from the point of view of the light they throw on the religious and social history of Ceylon. Some of these, e.g., the Vimāna- and Peta-vatthu and Jariyāpīṭaka Commentaries contain no references at all to any incidents in Ceylon.

Buddhadatta

Buddhadatta was a contemporary of
Buddhaghosa. Madhuratthavilāsinī, the
Commentary on the Buddhavaṃsa, is

1. Att 1. 2. Att 2, EV 1, 523. 3. See Mrs. Rhys Davids: A Buddhist Manual of Psychological Ethics. Introduction p. xxi.

attributed to him. At the time of writing this Commentary he was residing in a monastery at Kāvīrapattana.¹

Dhammapāla was a thera who dwelt at Badaratittha² on the south-east coast of India, a little to the south of Madras, and very probably he was a Dravidian by birth.³ The time

in which he flourished must have been somewhat later than that of Buddhaghosa as the works of

Dhamma-
-pāla. the latter are mentioned in some of his Commentaries.⁴ The works attributed to him are the Aṭṭhakathās on Udāna, Itivuttaka, Vināyavatthu, Petavatthu, Theragāthā, Therīgāthā and Cariyāpitaka. All these are called by the name Paramatthadīpanī . Dhammapāla drew his material for his works from the ab ancient Sinhalese Commentaries. It is also likely that he made use of Dravidian Commentaries that were available in his day in South India . The Commentary on the post-Canonical work Nettī, too, is attributed to him. This was written at the request of the thera Dhammarakkhita, at a time when Dhammapāla was residing at Nāgapattana in the vihāra built by king Dhammasoka.⁵

Saddhammapajjotikā, the Commentary on the Niddesa, was written by the thera Upasena of the Mahā Parivena at the request of the thera Deva.⁶ According to the colophon to this

1. For further details see P.L.O. 105 foll 2. Uda 436
3. P.L.O. 113 4. Vi in Uda 24, 236, 268, 283; EV in Uda 33, 43;
Att in Cpa 14; NA 170, 174. Also cf. P.L.O. 113.
5. NA 1, 233. 6. DN1A 108. MN1A 1.

book, Upasena, at the time of writing it, was residing at Am-rādhapura in the Parivasa built by the minister Bhattisena. The work was completed in the twenty-sixth year of king Sirinivāsa Sirisaṅghabodhi.¹ Such a name does not occur in the Mahāvamsa and Boruḅḡamve Revata there considers this king to be Aggabodhi I of the sixth century A.D.²

Saddhammapakkāsini, the Commentary on the Paṭi-sambhidāmagga, was written in Pāli in the third year after the death of king Moggallāna by a thera called Mahānāma. At the time of writing this he was living in the Mahānāma monastery built by the minister Uttaramanti.³

We are unfortunate in not being able to know any more details about this thera. Malalasekara is of opinion that our author is identical with the second Mahānāma whose name appears in an inscription at Buddhagaya.⁴

Lastly we come to Visuddhajānavilāsini, the Commentary on the Apadāna. It is not possible to say who the author was or when the Commentary was written. The Gandhāvamsa attributes it to Buddhaghosa.⁵ Sorata thera of Maligakanda, Colombo, has, in his admirable preface to the Hewāvitā-rana edition of the Apadāna Commentary, shown clearly that, in point of both subject matter and style, it cannot be ascribed to Buddhaghosa.⁶

1. CuN1A 1c8 2. Introduction to the Mahāniddeśa Atthakathā, Hew. Edn. p. iv. 3. MN1A-1, CuN1A-1c8. CA 526.
 4. P. L. C. 144, 145. 5. J. P. T. S. for 1886 p. 69.
 6. ApA Preface pp. iv, v.

CHAPTER II

The Sources of the Pali Commentaries.

When Buddhaghosa came to Ceylon there were already in the island many collections of commentarial matter preserved mainly in the Sinhalese language. Some of these collections were in book form, others as scattered literature embodying the views of learned teachers of the past. Buddhaghosa and the other commentators often refer to them quoting them as authorities.

Among the more important of these may be mentioned :

1. Mahā-atthakathā or Mūla-atthakathā
2. Mahāpaccariya-atthakathā
3. Kurundi-atthakathā
4. Andhakatthakathā
5. Samāhepatthakathā
6. Vinayatthakathā
7. Suttantatthakathā
8. Āgamatthakathā
9. Dīghatthakathā
10. Majjhimatthakathā
11. Saṃyuttatthakathā
12. Anguttaratthakathā
13. Abhidhammatthakathā

14. Sīhalaṭṭhakathā
15. Atṭhakathā (in the singular number)
16. Atṭhakathā (,, plural ,,)
17. Atṭhakathācariyā
18. Ācariyā
19. Ācariyavāda
20. Ācariyanata
21. Therasallāpa
23. Parasaṃvādaṃsī therā
24. Vitandavādi
25. Porāṇī
26. Porāṇakattherā
27. Porāṇacariyā
28. Porāṇaṭṭhakathā
29. Bhāṣakā
- ~~30. Milindapaṭṭha~~
- ~~31. Petaṅkopadesa~~
- ~~32. Vipavaṇṇa~~

Before proceeding further it should be mentioned that only a few of these were distinct works. Some, for example, the Sīhalaṭṭhakathā, the Suttantaṭṭhakathā and the Abhidhamma-ṭṭhakathā comprised whole groups of works, whereas some were possibly merely alternative names for others mentioned in the list.

It is not possible to say how many works were meant by the term *Sīhalatthakathā* (the Sinhalese Commentary). The *Mahā-atthakathā* , the *Mahāpaṇḍarī-atthakathā* and the *Murundi-atthakathā* were among them ; and according to Buddhaghosa there were other Commentaries as well which were well known, though perhaps not to the same extent.¹ The greatest number of references to these is made in the *Samantapāsādikā*.²

*Sīhal-
atthakathā*

Tredition is that the *Sīhalatthakathā* comprised the Commentaries brought by Mahinda to Ceylon and preserved there in the Sinhalese language.³ They evidently contained superfluous material, for Buddhaghosa mentions as a part of the task in his translation the removal of the error of repetition which he found in the originals.⁴ There were also places where an explanation did not tally with the Canonical Text and where Buddhaghosa had to give preference to the latter.⁵

*Mahā-
atthakathā*

Of these Sinhalese compilations the *Mahā-* or the *Mūla-atthakathā* occupied the foremost position. Most of the works of Buddhaghosa have drawn on this Commentary for their substance. As is evidenced from- from the references

(1) *Smp* I n.2 v.10 (2) See e.g., *Smp* I 2, 265, 266, 283; *Smp* II 288, 299, 300, 317, 318, 330, 349, 360, 376, 377, 454, 494, 496; *Smp* III 537, 618, 627, 716, 718; *Smp* Sn II 1, 9, 26, etc.
 (3) *SA* I 1, *Pap* I 1, *Att* 1. (4) *Smp* I 1.
 (5) Commentary on the *Yamaka*. J.P.T.S. 1912 p.83.
 (6) *Smp* I 2, *Pap* Sn 1030, *SA* Sn III 235, *Man* Sn 855.

made to it in the respective Atthakathās, it contained expositions on all the three Piṭakas.¹ It was more complete in its contents than the other Commentaries.² Expositions of words left unexplained in them were often found here.³ Buddhaghosa, usually, though not always, prefers the Mahā-atthakathā to the Mahāpaṇṇāsi and the Kurumī.⁴ The ~~great~~ great regard with which he held it is clearly expressed more than once.⁵ In some cases the interpretations given in the several Commentaries are recorded and the decision is left open.⁶ Mention is also made by Buddhaghosa of some faults in this Commentary (Mahā-Aṭṭhakathā) that were due to slip of the pen⁷ as well as of places where the exposition appeared to contradict the Text.⁸ Further, the Samantapāsādikā has recorded instances where certain Ceylonese teachers before Buddhaghosa's time differed from the interpretations given in the Mahā-atthakathā. One such teacher was the thera Mahāpaduma⁹ of the first century ~~B.C.~~ A.D.

According to the Paramatthajotikā, the Mahā-atthakathā did not contain comments on the last two verses of the Kakkhika Sutta in the Suttanipata. The author of the Paramatthajotikā is therefore inclined to consider that the original

1 (a) Vinaya : See references in note § 4 below

(b) Sutta: SumVil I 180, 182; Paṇḍ 33, II 204; SA II 179; Pj II 202

(c) Abhidhamma: Att 80, 82, 86, 107, 157, 410; Pug. Pañ Com in

J.P.T.S. 1914 p 235

2. See e.g. Pj II 202.

3. Smp II 349

4. Smp II 319, 317, 346, III 537, Smp Sn II 31. For preference given to other Commentaries over the Mahā-atthakathā see Smp II 319, III 537, 617, 716, 726.

5. Smp II 448, III 701.

6. Smp II 496

7. Smp II 311

8. Smp II 300

9. Smp I 283, II 454.

Sutta did not have these two verses.¹ The fact recorded here is significant because it points with more or less certainty to a specific instance of an addition, however small, made to the Pāli Canon a considerable time after it was brought to Ceylon and probably after it was committed to writing at Mātula Janapada.

There is also evidence that the Mahā-atthakathā contained a large number of anecdotes based on incidents that took place in Ceylon.² Buddhaghosa included in his Commentaries only a few of these stories which, had they been preserved in their entirety, would have given us a much clearer insight into the conditions of ancient Ceylon than we are able to have at present.

The Mahāpaccari and Kurundi Atthakathās were so named because they were composed on a raft (paccari) and in the Kurundivolu Vihāra respectively in Ceylon.³

As far as I am aware these two Commentaries are referred to only in the Samantapāsādikā and there, too, they are invariably mentioned along with the Mahā-atthakathā . In a few instances the expositions given in those two are preferred to those given in the other.⁴

1. Pj II (2) 477

2. Snp II 474, Att 80

3. P.L.C. 91

4. Mahāpaccari (preferred) Snp II 319, III 617
 Kurundi " Snp Sn II 59
 " (rejected) Snp II 346, III 688,
 Snp Sn II 401.

The Andhakatthakathā was handed down at Kāśī-
pura (Coṅjevaram) in South India,¹ and very likely it was
written in the Andhaka language. It is often referred to by

Andhak-

atthakathā

Buddhaghosa in his Samantapāsādikā . He refers
to it not so much to agree with its expositions
as to find fault with them. Sometimes he is
harsh in his criticisms. 'This is wrongly said'²

'that agrees neither with the Atthakathā nor with the Canon, and
therefore should not be accepted'³ - these are some of the ex-
pressions that Buddhaghosa uses in refuting the Andhakatthakathā
explanations. Buddhaghosa refers also to certain expositions
of the Vinaya which ^{were} ~~are~~ based on conditions that prevailed in
the Andha country and were therefore not of general application.⁴
A view expressed by the thera Mahāgama of Ceylon on the inter-
pretation of a certain Vinaya rule is regarded in the Andhak-
atthakathā as an authoritative statement.⁵ This thera lived in
in the first century B.C. and, therefore, we may conclude
that the Commentary was written at a date later than that
century.

Sankhepa-

Atthakathā

Another Commentary that is mentioned
in the Samantapāsādikā is the Sankhepa-
atthakathā or the 'short Commentary'. From
the fragmentary evidence of the Samanta-

1. P.L.O. 92

2. Smp III 697, Smp Sn II 204

3. Smp Sn II 8, 18, 214, 222.

4. Ibid. p. 8.

5. Smp III 646.

pāṇḍikā as to the contents of the ~~Mahāpaccari~~ Sāṅkhepa Commentary it appears that it had much in common with the Mahāpaccari¹ and it is possible that it was an abridged version of the same. According to Vijesinha 'the Sārattha Dipanī and the Vinati Vinodanī Tikkā enumerate two works called Andhakatthakathā and Sāṅkhepatthakathā, but the Vajira Buddhi Tikkā gives Cullapaccari and Andhakatthakathā.² This, too, leads us to suppose that the Sāṅkhepatthakathā was perhaps the same as the Cullapaccari (small or abridged Paccari)³

In addition to works such as the Mahā-atthakathā which dealt with the whole Canon there were also Commentaries that were restricted to the different branches of the three Piṭakas. Thus the Visuddhinagga refers to a group of works called the Vinayatthakathā. Sometimes the word used is in the singular number⁴, sometimes in the plural⁵. This probably means that there were more than one Commentary on the Vinaya and also perhaps that there was one which was more important than the others and which therefore could be called the Vinayatthakathā. We

Vinayatthakathā

etc.,

find similar references to Commentaries on the Sutta as well as on the Abhidhamma. The Visuddhinagga mentions

1. See Snp II 317, 381, 454

2. J.R.A.S. 1870 (Vol V, New Series) p.298

3. For other references to Sāṅkhepatthakathā see Snp II 311, 359, 477, 494, 496.

4. Vi I 272. Also see 151 97

5. Ibid. I. 72.

also the Suttantaṭṭhakathā¹, the Majjhimaṭṭhakathā², the Saṃyuttaṭṭhakathā³ and the Aṅguttaraṭṭhakathā⁴ and the Abhidhammaṭṭhakathā⁵. As the Visuddhimagga was the first work of Buddhaghosa in Ceylon, these references must necessarily be to the Commentaries that existed already in Ceylon when he came to the island. A Dīghaṭṭhakathā, too, is mentioned in the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī⁶ and this, again, is evidently a work that was in Ceylon at the time of Buddhaghosa's arrival in the island.

The Atthasālinī refers to some Āgamaṭṭhakathā⁷. Very likely these were the Commentaries on the four Āgamas or Nikāyas referred to in the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī and the Visuddhimagga as the Dīgha-, Majjhima-, Saṃyutta- and Aṅguttara-ṭṭhakathās. That these Āgamaṭṭhakathās were separate works and not merely ^{see} portions of the Mahā-ṭṭhakathā, which also contained commentarial matter on the four Āgamas is to be inferred from a passage in the Atthasālinī which ~~was~~ mentions side by side both the Āgamaṭṭhakathā and the Mahā-ṭṭhakathā.⁸

Moreover, the existence of a separate Commentary on the Jātakas is evident from a reference to it in the Pāli Jātakatṭhakathā.⁹

1. Vi I 272.

2. Ibid. 72, I 72, 184, II 547

3. Ibid. II 387, 432

4. Ibid. I 315. A section of the Aṅguttaraṭṭhakathā is also mentioned by Buddhaghosa under the title Dukanipāṭaṭṭhakathā. Vi I 142

5. Ibid. II 547

6. Sum Vil I 87

7. Att 188, 189

8. Att 86. Āgamaṭṭhakathāsu in The P.T.S. text is clearly a misprint for Āgamaṭṭhakathāsu

9. J.I. 62

Quotations made by Buddhaghosa and his successors from the Atthakathā and the Atthakathās are numerous.¹ As was mentioned in connection with the Commentaries on the Vinaya here,

too, the Atthakathā, when it occurs in any Pāli Commentary, refers very probably not to the Mahā-atthakathā but to the corresponding Sinhalese Commentary²; for example, when the

word Atthakathā (in the singular number) occurs in the Sumāṅgalavilāsinī it denotes the Sinhalese Dīghanikāya-atthakathā. But when the word occurs in the Visuddhimagga we may be more or less certain that it refers to the Mahā-atthakathā which was the Sinhalese Commentary par excellence. There are also instances where the word Atthakathā is used in a wider sense to denote the Commentarial Literature in contradistinction to the Pāli or the Canonical Texts.³ The Atthakathās (in the plural number), on the other hand, refer to the original Sinhalese Commentaries in general. With this difference in mind we may deal with the references to the Atthakathā and the Atthakathās relating merely to the whole group of the Sinhalese and ~~some of~~ the Dravidian Commentaries.

Buddhaghosa is very cautious when he deals with Canonical matter left unexplained in the Commentaries that were before him. Sometimes he explains a point and hastens to add a

1. Atthakathā (sing.) VI I 82, 82, 225, 316, II 384, 409, 449, 450, SumVil II 543, 652, 686, III 754, SV 56, 155, 200, Pop I 240, II 285, Man I 49, UdA 80, 85, 324.
Atthakathā (plural) VI I 1238, 172, 180, 193, 280, 285, II 432, 527, UdA 33, 94, 127, 328
 2. As it can be inferred from Snp II 300
 3. See VI I 96, 99, 107.

cluse of apologetic warning : 'As this has not been handed down
 in the Commentaries it should be accepted after investigation'
 (Atthakathāsu pana anāgetattā vīmaṇṇetvā paṇetabbā)¹. Even
 when Buddhaghosa is forced by his own reasoning to disagree with
 the Atthakathās he hesitates to give his definite opinion. "As
 it is said in all the Atthakathās" he says sometimes "it is not
 possible to reject (the explanation). What is correct should
 be found out or the Commentators should be taken on trust." ²
 The Atthakathā explanations are always preferred to those
 advanced by such well known teachers as Mahāsiva³, Tipiṭaka
 Cūḷabhaya⁴ and Abhidharmika Goḍha.⁵

These Commentaries, though they were compiled
 in the Sinhalese language, appear to have contained Pāli verses.
~~There are numerous verse passages in the Pāli-~~ We find only a
 few verses definitely attributed to the Atthakathās⁶ but ^{it} is
 possible that there w/ere many such verses. There are numerous
 verse passages in the Pāli Commentaries the sources of which we
 are unable to trace, and it may be that many of these were
 preserved in the original Sinhalese Commentaries as mnemonic
 verses.

1. Att 99, Sum VII I 73

2. Sap Sn II 21, See also Vi I 138. (These, it may be
 remarked incidentally, are further instances which
 clearly show that Buddhaghosa did not include his own
 views in the Pāli Commentaries.)

3. Att 267.

4. Sap Sn 902

5. Vi I 138. For other instances of views rejected by Buddha-
 ghosa on the ground that they were not found or ex-
 plained otherwise in the Atthakathās, see Att 421
 Vi II 375, Sum VII III 1001

6. Sap I 240, II 437; Pema 474.

Atthakathikā

&

Atthakathācariyā

Closely connected with the term Atthakathā are the words Atthakathikā and Atthakathācariyā. Those who studied and handed down the Atthakathās were known as the Atthakathikas.¹ By the other term ~~xxx~~ were generally understood the teachers (Ācariyā) responsible for the compilation of the Atthakathās.² Buddhaghosa holds the Atthakathācariyas³ in high esteem and says that they knew the intentions of the Buddha and therefore their word should be taken as authority.⁴ Pāli verses, too, are found attributed to the Atthakathācariyas.⁵

Ācariyavāda

Ācariyamata

& Ācariyā.

The Ācariyavādas (talks or expositions of the teachers) are the same as the Atthakathās (Ācariyavādo nāma Atthakathā).⁶ and in degree of authenticity are second only to the Canonical Texts. If any views expressed in the Ācariyavādas do not agree with the Suttantas the former are to be rejected.⁷

1. Pj I 151

2. An instance, however, of the use of the word Atthakathācariyā in a sense identical with that of Atthakathikā is found in Vi I 62

3. For some of the references to Atthakathācariyā see Vi I 103, 332; Sum VII I 187; Pap I 59, 225, 255; ManII 53; SV 310, 350; Att 123; Sum VII II 481; ItA 25; UdA 55; Pj I 110; PmaA 367.

4. Smp Sn II 12. See also SV 316

5. Att 85; Smp Sn II 218

6. Sum VII II 567. See also Vi I 96.

7. Sum VII II 568.

The individual views or opinions expressed by well known teachers are classed as the Ācariyamatas (opinions of teachers) and are different from the Atthakathā expositions.¹ These opinions, if they are not corroborated by the Text or the Commentary, are not to be regarded as essentially correct.²

Similar in significance to the Ācariyamatas are the expositions attributed to the Ācariyas (teachers) referred to often in the Pali Commentaries as Ācariyā vadanti and Ācariyā kathayanti.³ The great theras such as Mahāpaduma⁴ belong to this group of teachers.

Thera-

sallāpa.

A discussion that took place among the theras Kāḷhālāvāsī Sumana, Lokuttaravāsī Cūlasiva and Dīghabhāṇaka Tipitaka Mahāsiva is mentioned in the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī as a Therasallāpa.⁵ As to its value a therasallāpa is evidently equal to an Ācariyamata. The opinions expressed by similar teachers, but whose names have not been preserved, are given in the Commentaries with the simple introduction : keci vadanti (some say) or keci vappayanti (some describe)⁶.

1. Att 223

2. Vi I 107

3. More about these theras will be given in a subsequent chapter.

4. See e.g., Snp I 283

5. Sum Vil III 882

6. Pap I 35, 38.

Parasamudda-
vasī therā.

Some views of theras who lived outside Ceylon have also been preserved. They are referred to as the views of Parasamudda-vasī therā (theras living on the other side of the ocean).¹

The term Ācariyānaṃ samānāthakathā (identical expositions of the teachers) also occurs frequently, and is invariably found in connection with the refutation of the views proclaimed by the Vitandavādins.² It is difficult to say whether these different views and opinions of eminent teachers of old which are now incorporated in the Pāli Commentaries were found recorded in the original Sinhalese Commentaries or whether they were found preserved separately in the Mahāvihāra .

Pāli
Sources.

Buddhaghosa drew his material not only from Sinhalese and Dravidian ^{but also from Pāli} sources such as the Milindapañṇā³, Peṭakopadesa⁴ and the Dīpavaṃsa.

The last is quoted in the Samantapaṣāḍikā⁵ and in the Kathāvatthu Commentary.⁶ The passages referred to in the Samantapaṣāḍikā do not agree fully with the Dīpavaṃsa as we have it now.⁷

1. Pap Sn 718, 721, 730.

2. Att 90, 92, 241; Pap Sn 572

3. Vi II 438 . Sometimes passages are taken from the Milindapañṇā without acknowledging the source (see Vi I 283 foot note 1) ; and once a Milinda passage is quoted as from the Perīnas (Vi I 270)

4. Vi I 141, Snp I 143, MN1A 224

5. Snp I 74, 75

6. Kathāvatthu Commentary in J.P.T.B. 1889 p.3.

7. See Oldenberg's Edition pp 59, 61.

In addition to these we find in the *Vissuddhi-magga* certain verses - not yet traced - referring to two Ceylonese theras : Mahātissa of Cetiyapabbata and Ambakāśaka Mahātissa of Civaragumba.¹ These verses are very similar in style and subject matter to those in the *Theragāthā* and it is possible that there was in Ceylon an anthology of Pali verses composed after the model of this Canonical Text. The *Saṁanta-pāśādika*, too, has preserved two stanzas attributed to the two Sinhalese theras Mahāgumma and Mahāpaduma.²

Porāṇas

We now come to another important source of the Pali Commentaries, namely, the *Porāṇā* or the 'Ancients'. Considering the significant part played by them in our Commentaries it may not be out of place here to deal with the question at some length.

As to what is denoted by the term *Porāṇā* several interpretations have been put forward by scholars both eastern and western. More than half a century ago Hermann Oldenberg identified the *Porāṇas* with the *Porāṇatthakathā*.³ Mrs Rhys Davids is of a different opinion. She remarks : "These *Porāṇas* were not included among the Canonical compilers, or they would be quoted as such. They appear to have been of later date."

1. Vi I 21, 47.

2. Snp III 538

3. Oldenberg: *Dip.* pp.2,3. For *Porāṇatthakathā* see EV 1; UdA 2, 436; CpA 1.

They are the 'Fathers' of the Theravāda Saṅgha . They represent, in so far as they speak philosophically, the philosophy built up on the simpler archaically expressed teachings of the Suttas. They were cultured men ~~and~~ according to the light of their day. But they were working along a line of thinking that was 'orthodox' and therefore no longer free. And they do not represent the missionary mood of the Sutta teachers, anxious above all things to 'save souls'. They were the bookmen, the academicians, the cloistered scribes of the new predominant ~~orthodox~~ 'Buddhist' culture".¹

The views of B.C.Law are also on the whole helpful. He suggests that the great teachers of old (Porāṇa), referred to in the Commentaries, were probably the great and revered teachers who lived after the Parinibbāna of the Master and who were approached when difficulties as to the interpretation of some of the utterances of the Buddha arose among them ; and that Buddhaghosa, when he quotes the Porāṇas, does so in a way which makes it probable that he is quoting the direct words of these ancient teachers as when is the case when he is quoting a Canonical Text.² Law does not agree with Mrs Rhys Davids when she suggests that these Porāṇas represented a consistent school of philosophical thought. He thinks that 'each teacher must have been responsible for himself alone' and that it is hopeless to discover an organic connection among

1 Bgh p.vii.

2. Ibid. p.64.

the numerous short and long passages attributed to the Poṭṭāpas in Buddhaghosa's writings.¹

Still different is the view of Malalasekara. "I am of opinion," he says, "that the Poṭṭāpas merely refer to teachers whose expositions were not necessarily embodied in the Commentaries, but handed down in various schools by oral tradition, sometimes with mnemonic verses to help the memory, and that Buddhaghosa refers to such traditional explanations as the anonymous Poṭṭāpā"²

Having noted the views of these scholars we shall now proceed to examine the data available on the subject in the writings of Buddhaghosa and the other commentators.³ We shall first see how the quotations are distributed and what their nature is.

In the Pali Commentaries, including the Visuddhi-magga, there are altogether 116 quotations of which 85 are verse, 29 prose and 2 short sentences which are probably prose though they may also be fragments of two stanzas. The greater part of these are to be found in Buddhaghosa's works. The Niddesa Commentary of Upasena and the Patisaṃbhidāmagga Commentary of Mahānāma are also rich in them, whereas they are scanty in the Commentaries of Dhammapāla. The Commentary on the post-Canonical book Nettī has one verse quotation.

The following table shows how the passages are distributed.

1. Bgh p. 64

2. P.L.C. p 92

3. A collection of all the quotations from the Poṭṭāpas found in all the Pali Commentaries is given in

Appendix I a + b

		Verse	Prose	Verse or Prose?	Total No. of refer- ences.
	No. of references	No. of Verses			
Visuddhimagga	19	41	4	2	25
Samantapāsādikā	9	25	-	-	9
Kaikkhāvitaranī	-	-	-	-	-
Atthasālinī	1	1	1	-	2
Samnōhavinodanī	2	2	1	-	3
Pañcappakaraṇatthakathā ..	-	-	-	-	-
Suṃgaḷavilāsinī	6	7	5	-	11
Paṇḍitasūdanī	8	9	7	-	15
Sāratthappakāsinī	8	16	-	-	8
Manorathapūraṇī	2	3	2	-	4
Khuddakapāṭha Atthakathā ..	-	-	2	-	2
Dhammapada	-	-	-	-	-
Udāna	2	6	2	-	4
Itivuttaka	2	3	-	-	2
Suttanipāta	1	1	3	-	4
Vimānavatthu	-	-	-	-	-
Petavatthu	-	-	-	-	-
Theragāthā	-	-	-	-	-
Therīgāthā	-	-	-	-	-
Jātaka	-	-	-	-	-
Niddesa	6	8	2	-	8
Paṭisambhidāmagga,	13	14	-	-	13
Apadāna	4	4	-	-	4
Buddhavaṃsa	1	1	-	-	1
Carīyāpitaka	-	-	-	-	-
Netti	1	1	-	-	1
Total	85	142	29	2	116

Sometimes the same verse or prose passage occurs in more than one Atthakathā. For example, the verse

Bhagavā ti vacanam settham Bhagavā ti vacanam uttaram
Carugāravayutto so Bhagavā tena vuccati.

occurs in twelve Commentaries - in one, namely, Paramatthajotikā I it does not however occur as a quotation from the Porāṇas - and the verse

Yathā thaṃhā piḥandhevya vācchā dāman nāro idha

Bandhev'evap sakan gittā sativāramāṇa dāhan

occurs in six.¹ When the repetitions are removed the 142 verses reduce themselves to 90.² It is interesting to note that nearly one-fifth of this number - 17 verses to be exact - is found, though not under the name of the Porāṇas, in the Vimukti-saṅgraha, a Sinhalese prose work interspersed freely with Pāli verse and prose, and composed at a comparatively modern date.

We are, however, not justified in arriving at the conclusion that the list given above exhausts the number of the quotations from the Porāṇas, though they certainly are the only ones definitely called by that name in the Commentaries. Three verses given in the Sāratthappakāsinī³ without any reference as to their source are ascribed to the Porāṇas in the Visuddhimagga.⁴ Similarly two verses in the Buddhavaṇṇa Commentary⁵ and one in the Paramatthajotikā⁶ occur as

1. For further examples see Appendix II a and b.

2. See Appendix II a

3. "Ubhāṇa oḍeva nāro ca" etc. SA II 201.

4. Vi II 637, 638

5. BuA 14

6. Pj I 107.

quotations from the Porāṇas in some other Atthakathās.¹ As was already observed in another connection, there are in the Pāli Commentaries very many verse quotations the sources of which have so, ^{far} not been traced. It is quite possible that some of these may belong to the Porāṇas also. This fact remains - and perhaps will remain for ever - an obstacle in the way of our obtaining definite knowledge as to the real nature of the Porāṇas.

A glance at the Porāṇa passages shows that they, in some measure or other, deal with every aspect of the teachings of the Buddha, and also that many of them reveal a Commentarial nature. I agree with Law in 'thinking it hopeless to discover an organic connection among the numerous short and long passages.'² The subjects dealt with range from mere points of grammar to deep philosophical speculation, from pure legendary matter to history. The following brief survey will make this more clear.

On the
Vinaya
rules.

Buddhaghosa, on the authority of the Porāṇas, says, that a Vinayadhara bhikkhu in trying another bhikkhu on a charge of theft should take into consideration the following five points : the thing stolen, the time when and the country where the theft took place, the value of the stolen property, and also whether it had been used by its owner.³

-
1. See Appendix I a
 2. Bgh. 64
 3. Snp II 305.

Admonitions
in the practice
of jhāna.

There is a considerable number of passages which are of the nature of advice given to bhikkhus in the practice of jhāna . For instance, a bhikkhu who " enters into jhāna , after thoroughly purifying the other obstructions to concentration, abides in his attainment the whole day like a bee that has entered its well-cleaned abode, or like a king who has entered a well-tidied garden. Hence said the Ṭ Ancients :

One should dispel desire for sense, ill-will,
And worry, torpor, doubt as fifth, with mind
Delighting in seclusion, as a king
Delights on entering a clean retreat." ¹

Admonition
to lead the
higher life.

The admonition of the Poraṇas to a bhikkhu to lead the higher life and gain the anata or the deathless state is to act like ^{one} whose head is ablaze.

"Seeing these eight supreme advantages,
The sage reviews break-up and contemplates
Repeatedly to gain the deathless state,
Like one whose head is wrapped in blazing cloth? ²

Reflections on
impermanence etc.

A bhikkhu should reflect on the breaking up of the complexes (sankhārā) and know that what is called death is

1. VI I 152; P.P. II 175
2. VI II 645 ; P.P.III 788

their breaking up; and that there is nothing else. Hence the Ancients say :

"The aggregates are ceasing; there's nought else.

The break-up of the aggregates is death.

The ardent man wisely their loss discerns,

As though a gem were drilled with adamant.^{2/1}

On the

Abhidhamma

Practically all the Paurāṇa quotations on the Abhidhamma are found in the Visuddhimagga. They are numerous and noteworthy in that they represent a stage in the Abhidhamma more systematic and developed than the Canonical Texts and in that they try, as Mrs Rhys Davids points out,² to lay great emphasis on the Anattā or non-soul doctrine. This is evident from the following quotation given in the Visuddhimagga:

"There is here truly name-and-form,

Wherein exists no being or man.

'Tis void and fashioned like a doll,

A lump of ill, like grass and sticks.^{2/3}

Sutta Nomenclature.

Not only were the Paurāṇas considered as authorities on the exposition of the Vinaya and the Abhidhamma, but in the Sutta also their views were much respected. Buddhaghosa tells us that the Anumana Sutta⁴ of the Majjhimanikāya was called the

1. VI II 644. P.P.III 786

2. Bgh p.viii

3. VI II 595, P.P.III 718

4. M. Sutta No.15

Bhikkhupātimokkha by the Poraṇas ¹. In the exposition of the Pārāyana Sutta, too, the Poraṇas are quoted as authority².

Incidents in
the life of
the Buddha.

Certain alleged incidents in the life of the Buddha are alluded to in some Poraṇa verses. One passage describes how he walked immediately after his birth,³ and another how he went to the Saṁthāgāra Hall at Kapilavatthu.⁴

Legend.

The Paramatthajetika records the following legendary account given by the Poraṇas as to the origin of the town of Vesālī. In days gone by, the chief queen of the king of Benares gave birth to a lump of flesh. This was thrown into the river, but, under the protection of the devatās, reached the hands of a hermit, in whose hermitage it separated itself into two portions and in course of time became a prince and a princess. Later on they were brought up by cowherds and ultimately they became the king and queen of a newly established town. As the town was ~~unusually~~ ~~enlarged~~ enlarged again and again (punapuna 'visālī' katattā) it became known as Vesālī.⁵

Historical
Incidents.

From legend we now turn to history. The Samantapāsādikā, after giving in prose certain incidents relating to the coming

-
1. Pap II 67
 2. Pj II (2) 604
 3. Sum VII I 61
 4. SA Sn III 66
 5. Pj I 158 foll.

of Mahinda to Ceylon, quotes ^{some} certain Porana Verses as authority for the same.¹ Again, a ~~series~~ series of such verses is given to show the continuity in the line of teachers from the ~~in~~ time of Mahinda to that of a later date.² Some of these verses are very similar to those found in the Dipavansa.³

Cosmology Nor has cosmology escaped the notice of the Poranas. Buddhaghosa gives their ideas as to how this world is situated.

"The great world's rocky rim sinks in the deep
Eighty-two thousand yojanas, its height
Identical, encircling the whole world." 4

Exegetical Matter. There are also several references of an exegetical nature. These are mostly in prose. The author of the Khuddakapāṭha Commentary defines manussa (men) as Manuno apacca (sons or descendants of Manu), and then gives the Porāṇa definition which is mana ussannataya manussa (men are so called because they are mentally exalted).⁵

Grammar A passage occurring thrice in the Commentaries explains the usage of a grammatical construction. It points out that there ~~is~~ is no difference in meaning between tena samaya and tena samayena or ten samayan.⁶

1. Smp I 70.71.

2. Ibid p 62

3. See Dip. 12.vv 12,35-37

4. Vi I 206, P.P.II 238

5. Pj 112- I 123

6. Uda 23, Man I 13, Pap I 10.

Description of
Canonical Texts

The *Papañcasūdanī* and the *Apadāna* *Atthakathā* afford instances of another type. Buddhaghosa on the authority of the *Porāṇas* records that the *Majjhimanikāya* consists of 80,523 words (*pada*)¹ and the author of the *Apadāna* Commentary gives similarly the number of *Apadānas* in the Text.²

Closely allied to these references to the *Porāṇas* are those to the *Porāṇakattherā* (the *theras* of old), *Pubbacariyā* (former teachers), *Porāṇacariyā* (teachers of old) and *Atthakathacariyā* (teachers of Commentaries). It will now be seen whether these terms signified different men or were used indiscriminately ⁱⁿ to denote the same teachers or groups of teachers.

Porāṇaka-
ttherā.

A collection of passages referring to the *Porāṇakattheras* is given in Appendix II d. It will be observed that the references to them are considerably different from those to the *Porāṇas*. In them there is not a single verse passage. In one instance the opinion of the *Porāṇakattheras* is definitely set aside and another interpretation advanced by the original commentator (or commentators) of the *Anguttaranikāya*.³ In the other passages, too, the general tendency is not to take their views as definite authority, as it is the case with the *Porāṇa* passages, but to record them as explanatory or parallel

1. *Pap* I 2
2. *ApA* 84
3. *Man* II 26

notes. We are thus led to draw the inference that the *Porāṇas* are not the same as the *Porāṇakattaras*.

Pubbācariyā

In the opening verses of the *Kuḍḍaka-pāṭha Atthakathā*, its author states that in spite of his scanty knowledge of the *sāsana*, he is attempting to write the Commentary because the decisions of the former teachers (*pubbācariya-vinicchaya*) are extant upto his day. Immediately after this he says that he intends to base his work on the *porāṇa-vinicchaya* (the decisions of the ancients)¹ from which we may plausibly infer that the *Pubbācariyas* ^{are} were the same as the *Porāṇas*.

A quotation in the *Visuddhimagga*, too, strengthens this inference. Buddhaghosa desires his readers to realize how difficult it is to acquire a proper understanding of the *Paṭiccasamuppāda* (causal happening). To prove this his case he quotes a verse from the *Porāṇas*². However, he proceeds to expound this difficult doctrine in view of the fact that the *sāsana* is 'adorned with manifold ways of expression' (*manā dāsaṇā naya manḍita*) and that the path of the former teachers (*pubbācariya-māga*) proceeds in unbroken continuity. Then he requests his readers to listen to him attentively and quotes a verse from the *Pubbācariyas* (*vuttap h'etan Pubbācariya*) to point out the benefits of listening attentively

1. *Piṭṭi Pj* I 11

2. *Vī* II 522

to this doctrine.¹ Both these verses are on the same topic and the manner, too, in which Buddhaghosa has quoted them, gives us the impression that he is drawing his material from the same source.

Porāṇācariyā

The term Porāṇācariyā also occurs fairly frequently in the Pāli Commentaries. One naturally feels inclined to ask the question 'Are the Porāṇācariyas the same as the Porāpas?' The Gandhavamsa defines the Porāṇācariyas as the dharmasāṅgahaka theras or the theras who took part in the three Councils, but with the exception of Mahākaccāyana². Now, in the Milindapaṭṭha a certain verse is ascribed by Nāgasena to the dharmasāṅgahaka theras.³ This same verse, as pointed out by Mrs Rhys Davids, occurs in the Visuddhimagga as a quotation from the Porāpas.⁴ Thus, with regard to this verse at least, the Porāpas are the same as the Porāṇācariyas, both being the same as the dharmasāṅgahakas. The Gandhavamsa goes further to assert a connection between the Porāṇācariyas and the Atthakathācariyas (Ye Porāṇācariyā te yeva Atthakathācariyā).⁵

If what has been pointed out in the preceding paragraph is correct we may infer the possibility of a close connection between the Porāpas and the Atthakathācariyas.

1. V1 II 523

2. J.P.T.S. 1886 pp.58,59

3. M11 369

4. V1 I 270

5. J.P.T.S.1886 p 59

Buddhaghosa, commenting on the Ullapariyaya Sutta of the Majjhimanikāya, gives the Atthakathā exposition of the phrase pathaviṃ abhinandati. and coming to the next phrase pathaviṃ maffhati says that it has the same meaning as the previous one but that the reason for this \bar{p} repetition has not been discussed by the Porāṇas. Then he proceeds to give his own opinion (evam para na attano matī).¹ Here, evidently, Buddhaghosa takes Porāṇa in the sense of Atthakathācariyā.

Once more, while commenting on the Āsivisopana Sutta of the Samyuttanikāya, he quotes four verses from the Atthakathācariyas (ten'ahu Atthakathācariyā). A while later he quotes four more verses of a similar nature, but this time from the Porāṇas (ten'ahu Porāṇa).²

Further, the commentator of the Suttanipāṭa gives a very brief introduction to the Ratana Sutta and remarks that the Porāṇas open their exposition of this Sutta from the beginning of the story connected with (the building up of) Vesālī.³ Here, again, it is likely that the word Porāṇa has the same significance. But these instances are not sufficient for us to arrive at a decision about the identity of the two.

Porāṇatthā
-kathā

This leads us to the further problem of the relationship between the Porāṇas and the Porāṇatthakathā (the ancient Commentary). As we have observed earlier

1. Fap I 28

2. SA Sn III 40, 41.

3. P. II 278

Oldenberg was convinced that the two were identically the same. Geiger, too, is of the same opinion. He points out that the *Porāpaṭṭhakatha* which formed the basis of the *Mahāvapasa* is nothing other than the work of the *Porāpas* mentioned in its proem (1.2) and in the description of the *Mahāthūpa* (29.24) and also mentioned seven times in the *Mahāvapasa* Tīkṇī.¹ Geiger's argument is to me convincing.

On the other hand I find it difficult to agree with Malalasekara when he suggests that Buddhaghosa's references are to anonymous teachers of old, whose expositions were not necessarily embodied in the Commentaries but were handed down in various schools.² We have seen a remark of Buddhaghosa in the *Papañcasūdanī* about an explanation left out by the *Porāpas* . If the *Porāpa* interpretations were handed down in various schools by oral tradition, such a remark as that could have been made only by one who had carefully studied the traditions of all those schools. Buddhaghosa's stay in Ceylon was however too brief for us to assume that he could have studied them fully. But this would have been an easy matter if the *Porāpa* interpretations were available to him in the form of a compilation, either as a separate collection or embodied in the Commentaries themselves or if the *Porāpas* were the same as the *Atthakathācariyas*, a probability before noted. Further, the fact that prose passages of identical form are found quoted

1. D & M. 22 pp. 44 foll.

2. P.L.C. 92

more than once¹ suggests strongly that the commentators^r drew these prose passages from a written compilation.

The Porāpas were undoubtedly revered teachers of old and they must have played an important part in the formation and stabilising of the Theravāda school. They had their origin in India as is evidenced by the verses attributed to the ~~Channa-~~ ~~sahagaha~~ ~~theras~~ ~~in the~~ ~~Milindapañha~~ and to which we have made reference earlier. Probably they were not known in India by the name Porāpa. It may be that their views and interpretations of the Doctrine were incorporated in an old Commentary, and that when other new Commentaries ~~came~~ such as the ~~Mohā-~~ ~~aṭṭhakathā~~, ~~Mahāpaccari~~ and the ~~Kurundi~~ came to be written this old Commentary was called the Porāṇaṭṭhakathā, and the teachers whose views were incorporated in it were termed the ~~ḍ~~ Porāpā or the 'teachers of old'. Still later the distinction between the views of these teachers of old and the rest of the contents of the old Commentary may have disappeared and the term 'Porāpā' and Porāṇaṭṭhakathā acquired the same significance. Even as the shortened form 'Kurundi' was often used instead of the word Kurundaṭṭhakathā, so also the word 'Porāpā' may have been used to denote the Porāṇaṭṭhakathā.

We are, unfortunately, not in a position to know how many of the Porāpa quotations refer to the views of Ceylonese theras. Had this been known, it would have been of

1. See Appendix II b

invaluable help in tracing the development of Buddhist thought in Ceylon.

Dhāṇakas

We are now left with one other important source of the Pali Commentaries, namely, the traditions handed down by the 'Dhāṇakas' or the 'Reciters' of the various portions of the Canon. In the next chapter we shall deal with this source, tracing as far as possible the history from the inception of the Dhāṇaka system to the time of Buddhaghosa.

CHAPTER III

The Dhāpakas

When we consider the long ministry of the Buddha we are led to think that the discourses he delivered and the rules laid down by him for the guidance of his disciples must have been necessarily very extensive. As far as we have evidence no attempt had been made during his life-time to codify his teachings, though probably they were studied and remembered by his disciples in the form of 'collections' (samhitā = Pali * sahita). The word sahita in the Dharmapada verse Bahum pi ca sahita bhāṣaṇāno¹ very likely refers to such a collection. We may safely state that there were two such main collections : the Vinaya collection or the collection of rules and regulations for the guidance of monks and nuns and the Dharma collection or that of the Six discourses. The division of the Dharma into the Sutta and the Abhidharma is evidently a later one.

Origin of the Dhāpakas
 at their head are said to have assembled at Rājagṛha where they recited, classified and arranged the teachings. In that council it was deemed advisable to entrust different sections of the Canon to different

groups of disciples. The lack of suitable writing material and the consequent necessity of handing down the Texts by word of mouth from teacher to pupil made it expedient to adopt this division of labour. Different sections of the Canon were accordingly entrusted to groups of monks who were already noted for their proficiency in some those sections, as is evident from the entrusting of the Vinaya to Upali and his pupils.¹ The Dīgha, Majjhima, Saṃyutta and Aṅguttara Nikāyas were entrusted to Ānanda, the pupils of Sāriputta, Mahākassapa and Anuruddha respectively. Of these Nikāyas the Majjhima contains, in the Suttas such as the Amupada² material which may be considered as the main source of the later systematized Abhidhamma. It is therefore significant that this Nikāya was entrusted to the pupils of Sāriputta noted for his knowledge of the Abhidhamma. About ten centuries later Yuan Chwang noticed that on auspicious days Sāriputta was honoured by the Abhidhammikas.³ The group of monks to whom these sections were entrusted and their pupils after them preserved the teachings of the Buddha by learning and reciting the same. Thus they came to be known as the Bhāṇakas or the 'Reciters' of the respective sections of the Canon.

Classification
of the Bhāṇakas.

In the Pāli Commentaries reference is made to the Bhāṇakas of the Dīgha, Majjhima, Saṃyutta and the Aṅguttara

1. Sum Vil I 13

2. M. Sutta No. 111

3. E. Dutt: Spread of Buddhism and Buddhist Schools pp 205-206.

Nikāyas, the two Vibhaṅgas (Ubbato Vibhaṅga), the Dhammapadam and the Mahā-Ariyavaṁsa . One also often comes across the two terms Sarabhaṅga¹² and Padabhaṅga²³, but they have no connection with the Bhāṅgas that we are dealing with here. In no Commentary, as far as I am aware, is there any reference to the reciters of the Khuddaṅkaniṭṭha . But in the Milindapaṭṭha the word Khuddakabhaṅga occurs in a list of the Bhāṅgas.³ This occurrence is both interesting and strange. The Milindapaṭṭha, at least the main part of the book - and this passage is included in that section - is older than Buddhaghosa's Commentaries. And if Bhāṅgas of all the five Nikāyas existed in India at the time when the Milindapaṭṭha was compiled, how is one to account for the absence of any mention of the Khuddakabhaṅgas in Ceylon ? Did they not exist, or, if they did, were they not sufficiently prominent in the island ? Or is it that Buddhaghosa and the other commentators had no occasion to mention them ? The reference in the Milinda, however, gives us a definite clue as to the place of origin of the Bhāṅgas, namely, that they arose in India and not in Ceylon.

With regard to the three divisions of the Canon: the Sutta, the Vinaya and the Abhidhamma, we find that those who recited and handed them down were not known by the name Bhāṅga but were designated Suttantika, Vinayadhara and Abhidhammika respectively. Dhammadhara was another name for

1. Att 73

2. Man I 39, II 249. See also DhA III 345, IV 18

3. Mil. 342

Suttantika.¹ The Buddha himself was considered the first Abhidhammika.² Those who studied and recited the Commentaries were called Atthakathika.³ Besides these there were the Tipitaki (those versed in the three Pitakas) and the Catunṅkayikā (those versed in the four Nikāyas). Again, there were those who studied all the three Pitakas but specialized in one Nikāya. Dighabhāṇaka Tipitaka Mahasiwa there may be cited as an illustration.⁴ It is necessary to note here that being a Bhāṇaka of a particular section of the Canon meant only that the person in question made a special study of that portion and did not in any way imply an ignorance or neglect of other sections of the Pitakas.

There is also evidence for us to infer that in order to become a Bhāṇaka of a particular Nikāya it was not essential for one to learn the whole of that Nikāya. The Samantapāsādikā tells us that a bhikkhu who counts ten years from his ~~upāsampadā~~ ordination and who is at the head of a circle of bhikkhus should know at least, in addition to certain portions of the Vinaya,

if he is a Majjhimbhāṇaka, the first fifty discourses (of the Majjhimanikāya);

if a Dighabhāṇaka, the Mahāvagga⁵;

if a Samyuttabhāṇaka, the first three ~~VAGGAS~~ or the Mahāvagga ;

1. Man II 189

2. Att 17

3. Pj I 151

4. Sum VII II 543, III 883

5. The second ~~vagga~~ (chapter) including Suttas 14-23 of the Dighanikāya.

if an Anguttara-bhāṇaka, the first or the second half of
~~the~~ the Nikāya or, failing to learn it, the nipātas (sect-
 ions) upto the third - according to the Mahāpaṇḍita -
 atthakathā a bhikkhu learning only one nipāta should
 learn the fourth or the fifth ; and

if a Jātakabhāṇaka, the Jātaka book together with its
 Commentary - according to the Mahāpaṇḍita he should
 learn the Dhammapada, too, with its stories.

A bhikkhu who has learned these prescribed
 portions of the Vinaya and the Suttantas ^{becomes} is a well-read and
 capable teacher.¹

Provision also seems to have been made to enable
 a Bhāṇaka of one Nikāya to have as comprehensive a knowledge as
 possible without resorting to the study of other Nikāyas and
 their Commentaries. The preliminary detailed explanations
 often given in the same style and practically in the same words
 at the beginning of the Commentaries of each Nikāya would
 warrant this inference.

We shall now see what we can glean from the
 Pāli Commentaries regarding the special characteristics of
 the Bhāṇakas and the divergences, if there be any, in the
 views held by them.

As mentioned before, it is said that the
 study and the handing down of the Dighanikāya
 was entrusted to Ānanda and his pupils. Whether

Digha-
 bhāṇakas

the Dighabhāpakas of Ceylon were direct descendants of Ānanda in the lineage of teachers it is not possible to say. There was nothing to prevent a pupil of a Dighabhāpaka teacher becoming a Catummikāyika or a Tipitaka, and then order his pupils studying the Majjhimanikāya under him and becoming a Majjhimbhāpaka. The same may be said with regard to the reciters of the other Nikāyas.

There is a considerable number of references to Dighabhāpaka theras living in different parts of Ceylon. In Anurādhapura there lived several of them. The *Samuṅgalavilāsinī* mentions that at Ambalatthikā which was to the west of the Lohapāsāda, the Dighabhāpaka theras started a recital of the Brahmajāla Sutta and that at the end of it the earth quaked.¹ According to this Commentary some Dighabhāpaka theras were reciting the Mahāsudassana Sutta at the same place when King Vasabha (¹²⁷⁻¹⁷¹ ~~66-100~~ A.D.) went there and, on listening to it, was greatly pleased.² The *Apadānatthakathā* describes an anecdote connected with a young Dighabhāpaka living in the Kalyāṇi vihāra. The thera Dighabhāpaka Abhaya, too, lived at least for a time at Kalyāṇi.^{3,4}

Mention is made several times of two Dighabhāpaka ^{the} theras. One is ^{the} thera mentioned above and the other is Mahāsiva. In some places the former is called Dighabhāpaka Abhaya and in

1. *Sum* VII I 131

2. *Ibid.* II 635

3. *ApA* 128

4. *Pap Sn* 869

others Dighabhāṇaka Mahā Abhaya. Whether both referred to the same person or not we are unable to say definitely. The same is true of the latter who is referred to both as Dighabhāṇaka Mahāsiṃha and as Dighabhāṇaka Tipitaka Mahāsiṃha. Buddhaghosa quotes the name of Abhaya as a *thera* noted for his memory¹ and again as one famed for his patience with those whose words were insulting.² In the *Atthasālinī* there is an interesting account of how Dighabhāṇaka Mahā Abhaya converted a band of thieves who came to plunder the *Cetiya-pabbata vihāra*.³ In this and other accounts we have of this *thera* there is drawn for us a fairly vivid picture of his personality.⁴ Concerning Mahāsiṃha *thera*, too, there are many references in the Commentaries, but ~~with~~ these will be dealt with ~~exhaustively~~ in a later chapter.

We shall next see in what respects the reciters of the *Dighanikāya* differed from those of the other *Nikāyas*. Available material, however, is not sufficient for us to arrive at any definite conclusions.

The following points of difference in the views held by the *Dighabhāṇakas* and the *Majjhimbhāṇakas* are recorded in the Commentaries :

Dighabhāṇakas	Majjhimbhāṇakas
1. At the council held at Rājagaha, when the other 499 <i>theras</i> sat in their seats,	1. In order to make known that he had attained Arhantship Ananda <i>thera</i> did
1. <i>Sum</i> VII II 530 3. <i>Att</i> 399; <i>Smp</i> II 474	2. <i>Pap</i> I 79 4. For other references see <i>Man</i> II 249; <i>Vi</i> I 36, 266; <i>SV</i> 81 and also Appendix I a

Dīghabhāṣanaka

Ānanda, who attained Arahant-ship in the early morning of that same day, went last to the Assembly Hall and took his seat. He 'shone like the full-moon on a cloudless night, like a lotus touched into bloom by the rays of the sun; his face was pure, cleansed, radiant and resplendent as though it were proclaiming his attainment of Arahant-ship' (ānāna arahattapattin āroṇeyyaṃ vira).²

2. Theras at the first council recited the Texts:

Jātaka
Maha-Niddesa
Cūla-Niddesa
Paṭisambhidaṃga
Suttanipata
Dhammapada
Udāna

Majjhimbhāṣanaka

not go with the other theras. After they had assembled, they saw Ānanda's seat vacant and inquired where he was. Then Ānanda dived into the earth and appeared in his seat. Some (eko) say that he went through the air and took his seat.²

2. The Majjhimbhāṣanaka add to the list of the Dīghabhāṣanaka the three Texts :

Carīyapitaka
Apadana and
Buddhavaṃsa,

and say that the theras at the first council called this collection the Khuddakagantha

1. Sum VII i 10

2. Ibid. i 11.

Dīghabhāṣakas**Itivuttaka****Vimāna-peta-vatthu****Thera-theri-gāthā**

and calling them the **Khuddaka-gantha**, included the same in the **Abhidhamma Piṭaka**.¹

Majjhimbhāṣakas

and included it in the **Suttanta Piṭaka**.¹

3. (With regard to the degree of subtleness of the body when one is practising the **Anāpānasati** meditation.)

"It (i.e., the body-complex at the time when the **Anāpānasati** is practised) is subtle in the access to the First Jhāna, subtle in the First Jhāna, gross in the First Jhāna and in the access to the Second Jhāna, subtle in the Second Jhāna and in the access to the Third Jhāna, gross in the Third Jhāna and in the access to the Fourth Jhāna. In the Fourth Jhāna it is exceedingly subtle and attains to

"But the **Majjhima** Reciters desire that it should be more subtle at the access than at the Jhāna which is immediately below, that is, it is gross at the First Jhāna, subtle at the access to the Second Jhāna
....." 2

1. **Sam** VII I 15

2. **Smp** II 413, VI I 275, P.P. II 316

Dighabhāṣakas

extinction. Such is the opinion held by the Reciters of the Digha and the Saṃyutta.¹

4. "And when the after-image has made its appearance (in the practice of the Āpānāsati meditation) the monk should approach ~~at~~ the teacher and inform him thus: 'To me, sir, such and such an image has appeared.'

The teacher should not say, 'It is the image', but he should say, 'Friend, it is so. Give repeated attention to it'. Should he say, 'It is not the image,' the ^{monk} might become discouraged and dejected. Therefore without saying either, he should exhort him to give attention. So say the Digha Reciters." ²

5. The light (obhāso) that appears at the moment when a Buddha is born, does not

Majjhimbhāṣakas

But the Majjhima Reciters hold that the teacher should say, "Friend, it is the image. Attend to the subject repeatedly, good man."²

5. The light remains for a period of time as long as that which is taken in

1. Snp II 413; Vī I 275; P.P. II 316

2. Snp II 428; Vī I 286; P.P. II 328

DighabhāpakasMajjhimbhāpakas

extinction. Such is the opinion held by the Reciters of the

Dighabhāṣakas

remain even as long as the time taken to drink one mouthful of gruel. It only remains for such interval of time as is occupied between ones awakening from sleep and seeing an object.¹

Other differences are:

6. The Dighabhāṣakas held the view that Prince Siddhattha, before he decided to leave the household life, saw on the same day the four signs (sattāri nimittāni) viz., an old man, a diseased man, a corpse and an ascetic. Other Bhāṣakas maintained that he saw them on four different occasions, each at an interval of four months from the other.²

7. The term asamyttavāṇi was interpreted by the Dighabhāṣakas as : 'he who, being in the first period of his life (nathanavaya), pursues the twenty-six improprieties (assasā) and the six uncongenial spheres (assasā).' Others explained it as 'one whose all three doors of action are impure.'³

8. Lastly, the Dighabhāṣakas did not agree with the view of the commentators of the Abhidhamma Text Dhammasaṅgani regarding the interpretation of dittthilukama (restitute of views) as being a basis of all meritorious deeds.⁴

1. Pap Sm 921

2. BuA 232; J I 59; ApA I 54

3. Att 151

4. Ibid 159

Majjhimbhāṣakas

snapping the fingers ; it disappears before one could finish saying "what's this !" on seeing a flash of lightning.¹

Majjhima-
bhāpakas

Only one Majjhimbhāpaka there is mentioned by name in the Commentaries, and that is Revā there.¹ Probably he lived in Malaya, the mountainous district of central Ceylon ; but there is no means of ascertaining when he lived.

We have some information concerning the differences between the views held by the Majjhimbhāpakas and those held by others. It has already been seen in what respects the former differed from the Dīghabhāpakas. The Manorathapūraṇī mentions two incidents in the life story of the Buddha's disciple Bakkula, on which the Majjhimbhāpakas held views different from those mentioned in the Sinhalese Aṅguttaranikāya-aṭṭhakathā.² According to the Visuddhimagga the Majjhimbhāpakas differed from the Saṃyuttabhāpakas with regard to the interpretation of the phrase "eka dva santati vāra" (one or two intervals of continuity).³ In the Satipaṭṭhānasutta-vannanā of the Papañcasūdanī, Buddhaghosa says that some theras held the view that the subduing of Kammāsapāda by the Bodhisatta took place during the latter's birth as Sutasoma, whereas "these theras" (ime pana therā) held that the event occurred during his birth as Jāṭaddisa. The Tīkā to the Papañcasūdanī explains "these" as the Majjhimbhāpakas.⁴ In the same Commentary is mentioned still another difference between the Bhāpakas of the Majjhima and those of the other Nikāyas.⁵

1. VI I 95

2. Man I 306, 309

3. VI II 431 ; See also Att 420

4. Pap I 227

5. Pap Sn 893

Samyutta-
bhāṅga-

The Buddhavaṃsa Commentary records the reasons given by the Samyuttabhāṅgas as to why the Buiḍha Padumuttara was called by that name¹ The Samyuttabhāṅga there, Culasiva by name, is mentioned as an example of those people who, on account of their practising of love (mettā) are unaffected even by poison² This there lived ^{at} in the time of the Brāhmapatiṣṣa famine³ and was one of the foremost (pāṇḍita) among the bhikkhus of his day.⁴

Anguttara-
bhāṅgas.

There is no mention by name of an Anguttarabhāṅga there and the references to their views are meagre. Buddhaghosa, while dealing with the thirteen dhutaṅga practices in his Visuddhimagga, points out that the Anguttarabhāṅgas differed from the accepted tradition in certain details connected with four of them.⁵ It is not safe to generalize and arrive at conclusions from a few facts, but when we read these passages in the Visuddhimagga we get the impression that the Anguttarabhāṅgas were perhaps not so strict as the others were about rigid religious practices. The possible correctness of this impression is supported by another passage in the Manorathapūraṇī . According to this Commentary the teachers who maintained the Anguttaranikāya (Anguttara-mahānikāya valaṅkaraṇa ācariyā) considered all the Vinaya rules other

1.BuA 159

2.Vi I 313; Man Sn 847

3.The date of the occurrence of this famine will be discussed in a later chapter.

4.SV 446

5.Vi I 74-77

than the four pāṇjikā as lesser and minor (khuddakamūlakkā) rules.¹ This is clearly not in conformity with the views of the orthodox Theravāda school that considered strict adherence to all the Vinaya rules as a matter of prime importance.^{1a}

Jātaka-

bhāṣakas.

The Jātaka collection seems to have become very popular from quite an early date. There are, as we know, carvings depicting Jātaka stories in the sculpture of the third century B.C.² It must have been the love of the people for hearing and narrating stories that brought about this vogue.

The Papañcasūdanī mentions a Jātakabhāṣaka bhikkhu who lived in the time of the Buddha.³ This evidence is that from a fifth century book on an event that took place about ten centuries earlier. But considering the fact that Buddhaghosa compiled the Papañcasūdanī basing his material on very much older material and also that from a very early date the Jātakas were included in the nine-fold division of the teachings of the Buddha,⁴ it is possible that the reciters of the Jātakas were one of the oldest groups of the Bhāṣakas.

In Ceylon, too, preaching the Jātakas became very popular. King Iṇanāga (⁹³⁻¹⁰² 335 A.D.) heard, while he was at Rohana, the Kapi Jātaka⁵ from the Jātakabhāṣaka there

1. Man II 348

1a. Śālisthagga See Ullavagga XI sections 9 and 10

2. Rhys Davids: Buddhist India p.203

3. Pap II 305

4. M Vol I p 133; A II 7

5. There are two Jātakas by this name (Fausboll's Edn Vol II pp 268-270 and III pp 355-358) and also two bearing the title Mahākapi Jātaka (III 369-375 and V 67-74). From the nature of the Jātaka which has a special appeal to a king I am inclined to think that the one mentioned

here is III 369-375

Mahāpaduma who dwelt in the Tulādhāra vihāra . The king , being greatly pleased, 'restored the Nāgamahāvihāra and gave it the extension of a hundred unbent bows in length, and he enlarged the ^{a even} thūpaven to what it has been (since then) : ¹

The Manorathapīranī , too, gives us an account of a preacher of the Jātakas . A young bhikkhu residing at the Tissamahāvihāra in Mahāgāma heard that the Mahājātakabhāpaka there at Dighavāpi was to preach the Great Vessantara Jātaka² which consisted of one thousand verses, and so great was his desire to hear the preaching that he went to Dighavāpi travelling in one day the long distance of nine yojanas.³ This account is interesting for more than one reason. The Vessantara Jātaka is said here to consist of one thousand verses and appears to have been entirely in verse, but the one that we have at present consists of both prose and verse, the latter amounting to only 774 stanzas. The word Mahājātakabhāpaka there also is significant. It is not clear whether we are to take it as Mahā + Jātakabhāpaka there (the great there , reciter of the Jātakas) or as Mahājātaka + bhāpaka there (the there , reciter of the great Jātakas). Taking into account the nature of the Jātaka preached in this case, it is more probable that the word is to be taken as to signify a reciter of the 'great Jātakas'. If this interpretation is correct, then there were

1. Mv 35. 30-32.

2. J VI 479-593.

3. Man II 249

two divisions of the Jātakabhāṇakas: (1) the reciters of the ordinary Jātakas and (2) those of the Mahājātakas.

Still another episode connected with a Jātaka-bhāṇaka bhikkhu is recorded in the Sammahavinedani.¹

The Suttanipāṭa Commentary records that the Jātakabhāṇakas differed from others in regard to a detail in the story connected with the Candāla saint Mātanga. According to this Commentary the once conceited girl Dittamāṅgalikā, whose pride was now completely destroyed by Mātanga, carried in her arms the latter to his village. The Jātakabhāṇakas said that he was carried on her back.²

As noted before, Buddhaghosa tells us that in the Samantapāsādikā that, according to the Mahāpaccari Commentary, a Jātakabhāṇaka bhikkhu was expected to learn the Dhammapada with its stories in addition to the Jātaka stories.³ It was probably the similarity of the Jātaka stories to the stories round the Dhammapada verses that brought about this connection.

Dhammapada-
bhāṇakas.

There is very little information to be had about the reciters of the Dhammapada. One of them, a thera called Mahātissa, is mentioned in the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā.⁴ He lived in the time of King Daṭṭhagāmanī.

1. SV 484

2. Pj II 186. See also J IV 376

3. Snp Sn II 34

4. DhA IV 51.

The first words uttered by the Buddha were considered by some to be the verses 'Yadā have nātukhavanti dhammā' etc.¹ The Dhammapadabhāṅakas considered his first words to be the verses 'Anekajāti saṃsāraṃ'² The Khuddakapāṭha Commentary reconciles the two views by asserting that the latter verses were formulated mentally but were not uttered by the Buddha.³

Uḥatovibhaṅga
-bhāṅakas.

There is only one reference to an Uḥatovibhaṅgabhāṅaka therā, a reciter of the two Vibhaṅgas, namely, Mahātissa of Puṇṇavālika. He is quoted in the Samantapāsādikā as an authority on a Vinaya problem. Mahātissa bases his opinion on what he had heard from earlier 'great theras'.⁴

Similarly, only once is reference made to a reciter of the Mahā-Ariyavamsa.⁵ The term Mahācattārisaka-bhāṅaka, too, occurs once in the Samohavīnodaṇi.⁶ It denotes a reciter not of any separate Text but of the Mahācattārisaka Sutta in the Majjhimanikāya.⁷

1. Att 12 17

2. Ibid. 18. These are the verses 153, 154 in the Dhammapada. See also DhA III 127

3. Pj I 13. The Mahā Mahāvastu gives still another group of verses as the first words of the Buddha. For a valuable discussion on these different versions, see E.J. Thomas: Life of Buddha as Legend and History pp 74 foll.

4. Snp III 644

5. SA Sn III 151

6. Sv 320

7. M .Sutta No. 117

Bhāṇakas at the time of the compilation of the Commentaries.

The original purpose for which the Bhāṇaka system was established was a very useful one. But for this division of labour, it would have been impossible to hand down orally the teachings of the Buddha from the time of his parinibbāna upto the time when the Piṭakas were committed to writing at Alokavihāra in Ceylon about four centuries later. Even after this event the Bhāṇaka system was exceedingly useful as writing material was not easily available for the bhikkhus of Ceylon to dispense with the method of oral transmission.

However, as time went on, this system tended to create factions among the bhikkhus. Thus Buddhaghosa observes that in his day there were bhikkhus who had worldly affection (saṃsārita dhamma) towards the Doctrine and were in the habit of regarding: 'this is our Dīghanikāya and this is our Majjhima-nikāya'.¹

The Samantapāsādikā speaks of the proper and correct attitude to be adopted by the bhikkhus when a lay man came to invite them for meals and ask for a certain number of uṣṇa bhikkhavas, sāṃneras, Majjhimbhāṇakas or monks belonging to

1. Pap II 9. It may also be that this state of affairs prevailed when the Sinhalese Commentaries were compiled and that Buddhaghosa is here merely repeating what was found in the original documents.

some other group.¹ The passage referred to here leads us to ~~the~~ draw the inference that the distinction among the Bhāpakas of the various Nikāyas was sufficiently pronounced for the laity to attach different values to them.

The Samantapāsādikā records again that a bhikkhu who comes to get a case settled should not be questioned as to his caste : whether he is a Khattiya or a brāhmana etc, or as to his Āgama : whether he is a Dīghabhāṇaka or a Majjhimbhāṇaka etc.² This, too, indicates that the Bhānakas of a particular Āgama (or Nikāya) were perhaps of a different standing from the Bhāpakas of another Āgama.

In the Suttavibhaṅga-vannana Buddhaghosa says that a bhikkhu should not appropriate for himself any article which is given to the brotherhood as a whole, as it is not possible to reach all the bhikkhus & in order to make them relinquish the ownership of that article, but that this may be done in the case of anything given to a single bhikkhu or to a group such as the Dīghabhāṇakas.³ From this remark it appears that the number of the Bhānakas at the time in question was comparatively small, so limited in number that it was possible to reach them all if one wished to obtain their consent on any matter.

The Bhānaka system does not exist in Ceylon today, and it is not possible to say when it came to an end, nor is there now a way of ascertaining definitely in what form of record the views of the Bhānakas were available to Buddhaghosa.

1. Snp Sn II 329

2. Ibid. 394

3. Snp II 339.

CHAPTER IV

The Nature of the Contents of the Pāli Commentaries.

The *Atthakathās*, as we know, are exegetical treatises on the Texts of the Pāli Canon. Their main object is, therefore, to explain difficult words and abstruse points of doctrine that occur in the Texts and also to give additional explanatory information wherever it was deemed necessary. We need not doubt the sincerity of those who were responsible for these exegetical notes, but, as the Commentaries grew in the course of several centuries to be what we find today, extraneous matter inevitably crept into the beliefs that were held orthodox. It is this extraneous matter that is of interest to us in our present attempt to reconstruct the history of Buddhism in early Ceylon, as it enables us to see how far the popular doctrines of the *Atthakathā* period differed from those embodied in the Pāli Canon.

We may divide our material roughly into two groups :-

- I. Differences between the *Atthakathās* and the Canon, and
- II. Differences between one *Atthakathā* and another.

I

The first group may be subdivided into three

classes as follows:

1. A Commentary appearing to differ from a Textual statement,
2. A Commentary enlarging on a point raised in the Text, and
3. A Commentary adding new facts to what is given in the Text.

Class 1.

The Pali Jātakatthakathā mentions several places where the Sinhalese version differed from the Jātaka Text. Sometimes the difference is only in a single word. In the Gedha Jātaka occurs the stanza

Na pāpajanasaṃsevī accantasukham edhati

Godhākulam kakanto va kalip pāpeti attanam.

The Canonical Text here, we are told, had phalam instead of kalip, and the commentator rejects the former word on the ground that it is irrelevant.¹ Sometimes a stanza in the Atthakathā does not have all the words found in the corresponding stanza in the Text, or the words are found in different form.²

The Sammahavinodanī mentions an example where the Commentarial explanation is contradictory to the Text.³ A similar example is also found in the Paṭisambhidamagga-Atthakathā.⁴ An attempt to reconcile another contradiction, which the Pali commentator himself observes, is made in the Udāna-atthakathā.⁵

1. J. I 488. For other instances where the Atthakathā version is preferred to the Text, see Ibid II 175, 294

2. Ibid. II 241, 299, II IV 236, V 95, 273, 276, VI 36

3. SV 27, 28.

4. PMA 75

5. UDA 171

The commentator of the Buddhavamsa, too, points out an instance of such a difference between the Buddhavamsa and ~~the Khandhaka~~ the Khandhaka as well as the Aṭṭhakathā.¹

This brings us to the Buddhavamsa and its Commentary which reveal a considerable number of differences one from the other. Some stanzas given in the Text do not occur in the Commentary, and vice versa.² The last two chapters of the

1. BuA 44.

2. Bu (P.T.S Edn.)

p.18 vv.208-212,215,

220

p.19.v.16

p.20.v.17 line 1.1.

vv.26-29,32

p.22.vv.19-22,25

p.23.v.32

p.26.vv.17-20,23,29.

p.28.vv.17-20,23,30

p.30.vv.18-21,24,29

p.32.vv.17-20,23,29

p.34.vv.19-22,25,33

p.36.vv.20-23,26,31

p.38.vv.19-22,25,31

p.39.v.12

p.40.vv.21-24,30

p.41.v.36

p.42.vv.16-19,22,27

p.44.v.26

p.45.vv.14-17,20,25

p.47.vv.14-17

p.48.vv.20,24

p.49.vv.17-20,23

p.50.v.28

p.53.vv.24-28,30

p.54.v.36

p.55.vv.16-19,22,28

p.57.vv.19-22,25,30

p.58.vv.16-19,22,27

p.61.vv.18-21,24,29

p.64.vv.35-38,41,52

p.65.vv.8-12

These stanzas occur in the Text but not in the Aṭṭhakathā.

Stanzas that occur in the Aṭṭhakathā but not in the Text:

(1) BuA p.105, three stanzas.

(2) ,, p.115, first two stanzas (instead of Bu p.21. v.38)

(3) ,, p.135, last two stanzas

(4) ,, p.136, first stanza

(5) ,, p.140, second line of the verse Nakulā ca

(6) Also stanzas on pp.205,209,213,217 (2nd stanza)

Along with each of these there seems to have been other stanzas also, as it is evident from the phrase "sesa gāthāsu sabbattha pakātam eva = all the meanings (of words) in the remaining stanzas are clear."

Text, namely, the Buddhapakinnaka-khandā and the Dhātubhājanīya-kathā¹ are also not commented on in the Aṭṭhakathā. These differences are so great that we may rightly infer that the Text which the commentator had before him was different from the one we have today, and that the original Text received in Ceylon many additional verses after the Pāli Commentary was written.² Further, the Niddānakathā of the Jātakatthakathā quotes in full the first two chapters of the Buddhavaṃsa and the verses there agree with those in the Buddhavaṃsa Commentary and not with those in the Text, the differences being precisely the same as pointed out before.³ This fact, too, corroborates our inference as to the later additions made to the Buddhavaṃsa.

Class 2.

Instances of amplifications made in the Commentaries on the original Texts are more numerous. As an illustration we may make here a comparison of some parts of the Acchariyabbhutaḍḍhamma Sutta of the Majjhimanikāya⁴ with the Commentary on this Sutta.

Text	Commentary
(A) "When the Bodhisatta has entered his mother,	(Aa) The four gods are the Four Great Kings. Taking four from

1. Bu pp 66-69

2. This question will be dealt with later in the discussion on 'asābhavulavāra'.

3. Compare J I p 29 xx v. 216- p 30 v 223 with Bu p 17 v 207 - p 18 v 220

4. M III pp 118-124.

Text

four gods approach her to protect the four quarters (saying), 'Let nought human or anything else hurt the Bodhisatta or the Bodhisatta's mother'.¹

Commentary

each of the ten thousand world-systems they number forty thousand. Of them the Four Great Kings of this world-system stood with swords in ^{hand} in the bed room (of the Bodhisatta's mother), others stood at the door of the room, and so forth, up to the very end of the universe, all keeping guard to drive away hostile demons. They kept guard in this manner not because there was any danger to the life of the Bodhisatta, for none howsoever great could kill him, but lest his mother should perchance be frightened at the sight of non-human beings ugly to look at or at hearing the cry of a bird striking terror in the hearts of men. Another reason for keeping guard was that they were urged to do so by the might of the Bodhisatta's virtue. The gods were

visible to the Bodhisatta's mother at all times excepting when she was bathing, dressing, taking meals or performing the functions of nature; but as a result of the power of her own virtues as also her son's, she felt no terror in their intimate presence. She considered them merely as the wardens of the household.¹

(E) "When the Bodhisatta has entered his mother, there arises in the Bodhisatta's mother no thought of men connected with the senses, and the Bodhisatta's mother is not to be overcome by any man of passionate heart."²

(b) There arises in her no thought connected with the senses with regard to the Bodhisatta's father or any other man. It so happens not because she has destroyed all defilements but because of her respect towards the Bodhisatta. The likeness of her even a skilled artist cannot paint. It cannot be said that a man who sees her beauty will not feel an attachment to her. But if an impassioned man were to feel in-

1. Pap Sn 921, 922

2. E. J. Thomas, *op. cit.* p. 30.

(C) "As soon as born the Bodhisatta firmly standing ~~xxxx~~ with even feet goes towards the north with seven long steps, a white parasol being held over him (by the gods). He surveys all the quarters, and in a lordly voice says, 'I am the chief in the world, I am the best in the world, I am the first in the world. This is my last birth. There is now no existence again.'"²

inclined to approach her, his feet would not carry him, for they would be tied with a celestial chain. Therefore is it said that she is not to be overcome by any man of passionate heart.¹

(a) In the Text it appears as if (the Bodhisatta walked) immediately after his birth. But it should not be viewed so. As soon as he was born the Brahmins received him first in a golden net. From their hands the Four Great Kings received him in a soft antelope skin that was held to be auspicious. Finally from their hands men took him in a delicate cloth. After that he stood on the ground.

The 'white parasol' (mentioned in this passage) is a 'white parasol of the gods'. Along with it were the five emblems of royalty also, though in the Text the parasol alone is mentioned as in the

TextCommentary

description of a king's journey.
In that assembly only the parasol,
the sword and other emblems were
visible, but not those who held
them

The mention of the words
'all the quarters etc.' seems to
suggest that the Bodhisatta looked
at all the quarters at the end of
his walking the seven steps. But
it should not be viewed in this
manner.

The Bodhisatta, after
getting down from the hands of the
men (who received him), looked
towards the east. Then numberless
systems of worlds became one plane
and the devas and men residing in
them worshipped him with incense,
flowers and the like, saying :
'Great Being, here there is none
to equal thee; why speak of a
superior ? ' In this way the Bodhi-
satta looked at the ten directions,

namely, the four chief directions,
the four intermediary directions,
and above and below. Having seen
his equal in none of them, he walk-
ed seven steps towards the north.¹

to see

It is easy in these instances how far the
Commentary has deviated from the Text.

Again, according to the Pabbajjā Sutta in the
Suttanipāta, King Bimbisāra saw the Bodhisatta who, having left
the householder's life and become an ascetic, was going about
with a begging bowl in his hand in the streets of Rājagaha. The
king, noticing his serene look and gait, sent men to follow him
with the words : 'May the royal messengers run (to find out)
where the bhikkhu goes' (pāladūtā vidhāvantu lohinā bhikkhu
gacissati)². The Suttanipāta Commentary explains the words very
clearly without adding any extraneous matter to it,³ but the
Jātakatthakathā, referring to the same incident, puts into the
mouth of Bimbisārasamagga strange details as to how the
messengers should find out who he was. The king is reported to
have said : 'Go and find out who he is. If he is a demon
(asurapugga) he will vanish when he goes outside the town; if a
deity he will travel through space, if a naga he will dive into
the earth, if he is a man he will partake of the food that
he has received.' ⁴

1. Pap Sn 925. a, b and c are free and slightly condensed trans-
lations of the passages in the Papancaśūdanī.

2. Suttanipāta p. 72 v. 411

3. Pj II(2) 383

4. J. I. 66

The Dhammapadattthakathā, too, commenting on the stanza

Yathā pi rahado gambhiro vippasanno anāvilo

Evaṃ dhammāni sūtvāna vippasidanti paṇḍitā.

(Just like a lake deep, clear, serene,
when as they things in dharma hear,
wise men become serene, composed.)¹

explains rahado (lake) as that ocean which is undisturbed by the descent of the four-fold army. 'Rahado!' proceeds the Commentary, 'is the vast blue ocean, eighty-four thousand yojanas deep. Up to a height of forty thousand yojanas from the bottom the its water is disturbed by fish. An equal depth from the surface it is disturbed by wind. The water in the middle layer having a thickness of four thousand yojanas remains calm. This is what is called a deep rahado'.²

Here it would certainly have been the nobler service, had the Attthakathā not troubled to 'explain' the simple beauty of the lines. Numerous examples of a similar character, though, perhaps, not very many where the 'explanations' are developed to such proportions as here, may be cited.³ But the few that we have already quoted above are sufficient to show the enlargements made in the Commentaries on the original Texts.

1. Mrs Rhys Davids: The Minor Anthologies of the Pali Canon, p.31.

2. DhA II 152, 153.

3. See e.g., Pap Sn 767; SA II 156; Man II 239; Sum VII II 445, 575, 679; SA Sn III 193.

Sometimes we find also a Commentary giving a detailed explanatory statement and, in justification of the same, making some such remark as : 'This, too, was said by the Blessed One, but it has not been included in the Text' (idam pi kīṇa bhagavāṇa vuttam eva, palīyāṇaṃ na āgūhaṃ)¹; 'all this - what is included in the Text as well as what is not included - the Blessed One uttered' (idam palīyāṇa āgūhaṃ ca anāgūhaṃ ca sabbaṃ bhagavā evoca).² or the 'Text has come in brief' (idam pi kīṇa bhagavāṇa vuttam).³

Class 3

This brings us to the consideration of the inclusion in the Commentaries of matter which takes the form not merely of enlarging on what is contained in the Texts but of definite additions to them. Not seldom do we come across the modes of exposition known as the Sambhula-vāra (manifold section) and the Palimuttakavāra (method of issuing or drawing out from the Text).

The Buddhavamsa-aṭṭhakathā makes evident the real nature of the former. According to this Commentary the ex-
description in the Buddhavamsa of each Buddha consists of twenty sections such as the declaration of the cycle of time (kappa) in which a particular Buddha was born, his name and so forth. But, adds the Commentary, here the sambhulavāra, too,

1. Sam VII I 238; SA I 201

2. Sam VII II 636

3. SV 124, see also 122 Ibid. 209.

should be inserted, which consists of the ten ~~sentiments~~ sections, viz., the declaration of

- 1.the period which each Buddha spent as a householder,
- 2.the three palaces,
- 3.the dancing women (who were of his retinue),
- 4.the chief queen,
- 5.~~son~~, the son,
- 6.the mode of conveyance (used by him when leaving home),
- 7.the setting forth (into the homeless life),
- 8.the period of exertion,
- 9.the (chief attendants), and
- 10.the vihara.

The commentator further declares that he would briefly deal with these ten also in the course of his work.¹

Now these are precisely the same items as are found included in our Buddhavamsa but left uncommented in the Atthakatha.² The inference to be drawn is clear. Before the Pāli Commentary was written the verses that described these items were not included in the Text. They formed a part of each chapter of the Sinhalese Buddhavamsa Commentary. The verses were, however, modelled on the style ~~as~~ of the Text, and this close resemblance in style as well as in subject matter naturally induced the later editors to insert these verses

1.BuA 2,3,105

2.See E.J.Thomas; Life of Buddha as Legend and History, p.49 note 1.

in their Text.

The *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* and the *Papañcasūdanī*, too, give instances of the use of *sambhulavara*¹ by way of justifying the inclusion of additional matter in connection with the early life of the Buddha.² It is not possible to say what the origin of these accounts was, though there is little doubt that the accounts were handed down by tradition from a time much earlier than the writing of the Commentaries.

Though not appearing under the name *sambhulavara*, there are numerous other instances where additional matter is given in the *Atthakathas*. Several of the accounts given in the *Buddhavamsa* Commentary belong to this category; e.g., the subduing of the demon *Nāga* by the Buddha *Sumaṅgala* *Dīpaṅkara*,³ the Buddha *Sumaṅgala* giving, while he was yet a *Bodhisatta*, his two children as alms to a *yakkha*⁴ and the manner in which he burned himself as a torch in front of the *cetiya* of a previous Buddha.⁵ Not a single of these episodes is mentioned in the Text. The same Commentary gives the names of three Buddhas prior to Buddha *Dīpaṅkara*,⁶ and here, too, the Text is silent on them.

The *Manorathapūraṇī* narrates an episode connected with the life of *Guttila*, the musician. He sent a thousand

1. *Sum* VII II 440; *Pap* Sn 926

2. In the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* the account given is of the life of Buddha *Vipassī*, whereas in the *Papañcasūdanī* the same account refers to that of Buddha *Gotama*.

3. *BuA* 101

4. *Ibid.* 116

5. *Ibid.* 117

6. *Ibid.* 106

pieces of money to a certain woman, but she refused it slightly. Enraged at this, Uttila went one evening to the door of this woman and began to sing in accompaniment to his musical instrument. Hearing his singing she was so enchanted that with the intention of approaching him she stepped out of the open window thinking that it was the door. The result was that she fell down and died.¹ An account of Uttila's life and activities is given in the *Jātakapṭhakathā*, but this episode does not occur in it.² Nor am I aware of any other place where this is mentioned.

The *Visuddhimagga*, too, in its exposition of the Aggregates describes a number of rūpa (material qualities) and then says : 'These are the material qualities that are mentioned in the Text. But the Commentary ⁱⁿ other material qualities are brought together, to wit : the material quality of strength, of origin, of profusion, of ill-health and , in the opinion of some, of torpor'.³ Here the distinction is between the Text and the Commentary. Sometimes these two modes of exposition are called the Sāsana-naya or Desanā-naya (method of the Teaching) and the Atthakathā-naya respectively.⁴ When referring to the Abhidhamma Texts the word Pakarapa-naya is also used in place of Desanā-naya.⁵

1. Man I 28

2. J II 248 foll.

3. Vi II 450, P.P: II 523; See also Vi II 433, Pap I 245

4. Pap I 38; Att 422, 427

5. SV 215; Sum Vil III 754.

The detailed description of the five antara-dhāna (disappearances) given in the Manorathapūraṇī is also a clear example of such later additions.¹

The other mode of addition, namely, the pa Pāli-mūlhasamaya mūttaka-naya, is not so independent of the Canonical Texts as is the sambhulavāra. Here the addition must receive the sanction of the Canon or at least must be such that it can be deduced directly or indirectly from the same. It occurs most frequently in the Samantapāsādikā. Many rules of conduct of the bhikkhu, not laid down in the Vinaya, have been formulated on this line.² The Commentary on the Puggalapāṇṇatti gives us an illustration of the same development in the Abhidhamma.³

We find a still further development of this in the Atthakathā-mūttaka-sāriyaṇaya or the mode of exposition of the teachers as deduced from the Commentaries. The last named Commentary provides us with illustrations of this naya also.⁴

There is yet another mode of exposition, namely, the Sadda-naya or the philological method.⁵ This is restricted to the exposition of the meanings of words.

II

Finally, we come to the consideration of some of the differences found between one Atthakathā and another.

1. Man I 87 foll.

2. See e.g., Snp II 290-294, 476, III 713 Snp Sn II 13, 69.

3. J. P. T. S. 1914 p. 171

4. Ibid. pp. 173, 174

5. Man I 113; Pnp Sn 566; see also the definition of the word Sāvatthi Sāvatthi Pj I 110

These differences are on quite a variety of topics, and therefore it is not possible to arrange them in any definite order. Nor is it possible, within the scope of this work, to deal with all of them. Most of these differences, no doubt, existed as such in the original *sutrā* Sinhalese and Dravidian Commentaries. The authors themselves, of the Pāli Commentaries, have pointed out some of them.¹ For others we have to depend on a comparison of the contents of their works. The following are a few of these differences:

(1) Shortly after the birth of Prince Siddhattha, the ascetic Kāladevala, desiring his nephew Nālaka to renounce the home-life and await Siddhattha's attainment of Buddhahood, went to his sister's house and asked her where Nālaka was. She replied: 'Sir, he is in the house' (*ghe avva ti*)². This is the version of the *Jātakaṭṭhakathā*. The *Paramatthajotikā* referring to the same incident says that her reply was: 'Sir, he is playing outside' (*bahi bhante kīlati*)³.

(2) According to the *Buddhavaṃsa-aṭṭhakathā* the relatives of King Buddhodana refused at first to give their daughters in marriage to Prince Siddhattha, for, they said that the latter was not versed in any art and was therefore incapable of supporting a wife. By way of reply to this charge, Siddhattha exhibited in public his skill in all the arts necessary to be known by a prince, whereupon the relatives readily agreed

1. See e.g., Udā 101. Some of these differences we have already discussed when dealing with the Sources of the Pāli Commentaries.

2. J I 55

3. Pj II(2) 489

to the original proposal of Buddhodana.¹ The Jātakatthakathā has a different version of the account. It says that some time after the marriage of the prince, a talk arose among his relatives: 'Siddhattha is devoting himself to mere enjoyment; and he is unskilled in any art. What will he do in the event of a war?' Buddhodana heard this talk and informed the prince of it. It was then that the latter exhibited his skill and removed the doubts of his kinsmen.²

(3) Most of the Commentaries agree that before leaving home for the homeless life, Prince Siddhattha saw four signs, namely, an old man, a sick man, a corpse and an ascetic.³ The Buddhavaṃsa Atthakathā, however, describes only three and leaves out the seeing of the corpse.⁴

(4) In the account of the young man Maṭṭakundali, whose death was caused by the miserliness of his father, it is said that a short while before Maṭṭakundali passed away he was removed outside and laid on the terrace of the house. According to the Dhammapadamatthakathā the reason for doing so was his father's fear that if the lad died inside the house, the people who were attending the funeral would see his wealth.⁵ The Vimānavatthu-atthakathā says that the father acted thus in order to save himself the trouble of removing the corpse from the inside of the house.⁶

1. BuA 230, 231
2. J I 58
3. Ibid, I 59

4. BuA 231, 232
5. DhA I 26
6. VVA 322

(5) The Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā defines the word gono as a cowherd looking after others' cows and who is entitled only to the day's wages.¹ The Paramatthajotikā gives quite the opposite definition, according to which gono denotes a cow owner looking after his own herd.²

The above are more or less typical examples of differences found in the Commentaries. These differences are, as we see, with regard to non-essential details and they hardly affect the fundamental teachings of the Canon.

What we have discussed in the present chapter and in the three preceding ones may be summarized thus :

When Buddhaghosa came to Ceylon in the early part of the fifth century A.D. there ~~was~~ was in Ceylon a vast collection of Commentarial literature preserved for the most part in the Sinhalese language. These Commentaries were the result of a gradual growth during several centuries, and from internal evidence it appears that they ceased to grow by about the middle of the first century A.D.

The Mahā-aṭṭhakathā was the most useful among them. Besides pure exegetical matter there was embodied in it

1.DhA I 157
2.Pj II 28

and in other Commentaries also a large number of episodes dealing with incidents that took place or were alleged to have taken place in Ceylon. Many of these are preserved for us in the Pāli Commentaries, and they throw invaluable light on Buddhist life in Ceylon.

The arrangement of these episodes in a chronological order is, at least to a small extent, made possible by the existence of the two Ceylon Chronicles, the *Dīpavamsa* and the *Mahāvamsa*.

The Pāli Commentaries as well as their Sinhalese sources show a certain development on or a going away from the contents of the Canonical Texts. The views attributed to the *Porāṇas* and the *Bhāṣakas* are specially interesting and useful in tracing this development which indicates to us the changes that the faith underwent in Ceylon. The changes, however, were restricted to details and did not affect much the fundamental teachings of the Canon.

Having made this brief survey of the material at our disposal, namely, the Pāli Commentaries, we are now in a better position to enter into a more detailed study of the state of Buddhism in early Ceylon.

PART II

The Chronicles as well as the Samantapāsādikā try to show that the conversion of Ceylon took place after the arrival of Mahinda and that there were no Buddhists in the island before that date. A careful survey, however, of the contents of these same books may make us arrive at a different conclusion. But it need not be doubted that Buddhism was officially introduced to Ceylon during the reign of Devānampiyatissa. Before investigating the existence of Buddhism prior to the advent of Mahinda it would not be out of place here to give a general idea of the pre-Buddhist religious beliefs in Ceylon.¹

As far as we can gather from the incidental references in the Chronicles and, to a certain extent, in the Samantapāsādikā, the religions practised by the inhabitants were mainly Brāhmanism - if we may use this inclusive though somewhat inaccurate term - , worship of Yakṣas and tree-deities, Jainism and a few other cults. It is, however, likely that the new colonists could not devote themselves much to religious pursuits as their time must have been fully occupied in making habitable and improving their newly acquired territory and also probably in defending themselves against the attacks of the aboriginal Yakkha and Nāga tribes.

1. Mr S. Paranavitana has dealt with this subject in detail in a paper read before a General Meeting of the R.A.S. (Ceylon Branch) on 2nd. Nov. 1929.

From the very beginning, since the arrival of Vijaya and his followers in about the year 483.B.C. the brāhmanas enjoyed a prominent status in Ceylon. The immigrants to the island from north India, where the brahmana, no doubt, was an important and respected person, continued to show the same regard for him even in their new home. One may perhaps be justified in supposing that the brāhmanas lost much of that power after the Sinhalese kings embraced Buddhism. Even in later times we do hear now and then of powerful brāhmanas, strong enough at times to raise a rebellion against the ruling monarch. But these will be dealt with in their appropriate places.

There were brāhmanas who came along with Vijaya to Ceylon. Upatissa was one of them. He founded the village Upatissagāma which was for some time the capital of Ceylon. The same brahmana held the post of chaplain (*marhita*) to king Vijaya.¹ Pandukabhaya as a young prince received his education under the brahmana named Pandula. The son of the latter became in due course the chaplain to Pandukabhaya (394-307 B.C.).² When Devanampiyatissa sent presents to Asoka, the prince Arittha was accompanied by the king's chaplain who was a brāhmana.³ Several other references, too, of a like nature can be easily found. The presence of these brāhmanas naturally implies the existence of their religious beliefs in Ceylon at that time.

1. *Iv* 7.44

2. *Ibid.* 10.20 foll.

3. *Ibid.* 11.20

The Worship
of Yakṣas.

King Paṇḍukābhaya built a temple for the Yakṣa Cīttarāja.¹ Paruṇavitāna is of opinion that Cīttarāja was a water spirit.² Further, he shows that a Yakṣa named Cīttarāja was the object of a popular cult in ancient India as is seen from the Kuru-dhamma Jātaka.³ Other Yakṣas worshipped in Ceylon were Kālavela, Maheja, Vaiśravapa, Jutindhara, Vibhīṣana, Kākṣasaka Kalaśodara, and the Yakṣinīs Vajravālukhī and Paśchimarājīnī. The conditions, in pre-Buddhist Ceylon, of the Yakṣa cults appear to have been exactly similar to those in North India in the time of the Buddha; and, in spite of the adoption of Buddhism as the national religion, the earlier Yakṣa worship flourished side by side among the masses and has persisted down to modern times.⁴

Tree-
deities.

Paṇḍukābhaya fixed a banyan tree near the Western Gate of Amaraśāhapura as the abode of Vaiśravana, and a palmyra palm as that of Vyādha-deva.⁵ Here we have two instances of the worship of tree deities in pre-Buddhist Ceylon.

Patron
Deities.

The Vyādha-deva, mentioned above was the patron deity of the hunters. Another such deity was Kammāra-deva or the god of

1. Mv 10.88

2. J. R. A. S. (C. B.) 1929 pp 302 foll.

3. J II pp 365-381

4. ~~Edinb~~ J. R. A. S. (C. B.) 1929 p 317

5. Mv 10.89

the blacksmiths. In addition to these deities of particular trades there was also a guardian deity of the whole city of Amarakapaya.¹

Jainism
dwelling

Pandukabhaya is said to have built dwelling places for the Niganthas (i.e., Jains) named Jotiya and Kumbhanda.

Another Nigantha called Giri lived in the locality where Jotiya was.² The monastery of Giri was demolished by King Vattagāmaṇi Abhaya (29-17 B.C.) and in its place was built the Abhayagiri-vihāra³, which in subsequent times, played an important part in the history of Buddhism in Ceylon. When these Jains came to Ceylon it is not possible to say. But we know that ever since the arrival of Vijaya, there was a constant flow of immigrants to Ceylon from India, especially from the northern part of that sub-continent. From north-western India travelling by sea to Ceylon was not a difficult task. There is no reason to suppose that Jains, too, did not come along with the other immigrants. But no conversion to any appreciable extent took place in Ceylon, perhaps, because Jainism, unlike Buddhism, was not a missionary religion. We hear practically no more of them in the Ceylon Chronicles, except by way of an incidental remark in the Mahāvamsa that in the eighteenth year of King Kassapa (478-496 A.D.) his brother Moggallāna who had fled to

1. J.R.A.S. (C.B.) 1929 p 319

2. MV 10.vv 97-99

3. Ibid. 33.44

India came hither at the information of the Niganthas with twelve distinguished friends from Jambudipa and collected troops at the Kuthārivihāra in the Ambatthakola district.¹ Here, again, it is difficult to say whether these Jains were inhabitants of Ceylon or of India, though from the nature of the information, it is more likely that they were Ceylonese.

The Paribbājakas, a class of wandering teachers or sophists², ^{and Ajivakas} the followers of Makhalī Gosāla, too, were known in early Ceylon. Panḍukābhaya built a monastery for the Paribbājakas and another for the Ajivakas.³

Further, we are told that Bhaddakaccānā and her attendants came to Ceylon disguised as nuns (pabbajitā)⁴, and that in the time of Panḍukābhaya there were many Pisandakas and ascetics (samanā)⁵. To what sects these words pabbajitā and samanā referred we are unable to say, as these words can be applied to any sect of non-brāhmanical ascetics, including the Buddhist monkhood. Nor do we know what religious beliefs were held by the five hundred pagan families (micchā-ditthika - kula) settled to the west of Amurāthapura by Panḍukābhaya.⁶

1. Mv 39.20

2. Rhys Davids : Buddhist India p 141

3. Mv 10.vv 101-102

4. Ibid 10.98 8.24

5. Ibid. 10.98

6. Ibid. 10.100

Let us now see what evidence we have for the existence of Buddhism in pre-Mahindian Ceylon.

Buddha's
visits to
Ceylon.

Buddha is said to have visited the island of Lanka three times. These visits are mentioned in the historical section of the *Samantapāsādikā*.¹ In the *Dīpa-vamsa* and the *Mahāvamsa* they are described in detail.

The first occurred in the fifth month after the Enlightenment. In the centre of Lanka, in the delightful Mahānaga garden, the customary meeting place of the Yakṣas, there was a great gathering of the Yakṣas dwelling in the island. The Buddha went to this assembly and hovering in the air over their heads, at the place of the (future) Mahiyangana thūpa, he struck terror into their hearts by rain, storm, darkness and such phenomena. Next, having released them from darkness their terrors, the Blessed One caused the pleasant Giridīpata to come near to them, and by a device made them withdraw to that land. When they had settled there, he made the land return to its former place. Then, the devas assembled, and in their assembly the Master preached the Doctrine. Many hois of beings attained the realisation of the Truth (*Dhammābhisamaya*), and countless were those who came unto the three Refuges and the Precepts of Duty.² Buddha freed Lanka of

1. Sup [89

2. Mr 1. 21 foll.

the Yakṣas because he foresaw that that fair isle would after his passing away be the stronghold of his teachings.¹ The Nāga Maniakkhika of Kalyāṇi, we are told, accepted the Buddhist faith during this first visit of the Master.²

The second visit took place in the fifth year after the Enlightenment. This visit was to save two hostile Nāga kings from an impending war which, if fought, would have been disastrous to both parties. After settling their dispute the Buddha preached the Doctrine and eighty koṭis of Nāgas dwelling in the ocean and on the mainland were converted.³

Three years later the Enlightened One visited the island again at the request of Maniakkhika.⁴ It was during this visit that the Buddha is said to have left the imprint of his foot on the peak of the Sumana Mountain.

These visits, as noted above, are recorded only in the Dīpavamsa, Samantapāsādikā and the Mahāvamsa. No mention is made of them in any part of the Pāli Canon. This negative evidence, though a weighty one, is not sufficient for us to arrive at a decision and deny the truth of this tradition. As Malalasekara observes 'how much of truth there is in these descriptions we have no way of ascertaining at this distant date; but that the tradition was a very old one, there is no doubt at all.'⁵ *This tradition may probably have*

1. Sup I 89

2. Mv 1.64

3. Ibid. 1.44 foll.

4. Ibid 1.71 foll

5. P.L.G. pp 13,14

arisen from the arrival, before the advent of Mahinda, of some Buddhist missionaries from India and also from the existence in Ceylon of a considerable number of Buddhists among the earlier inhabitants, namely, the Yakshas and the Nagas.

To support this hypothesis there is another valuable reference in the Mahāvamsa. The Mahāvamsa Mahiyāṅga thūpa, says the Great Chronicle, existed in Ceylon long before the arrival of Mahinda. When the Buddha first visited Ceylon, the deva Mahasumana of the Sumanakūṭa Mountain requested the Buddha to give him something to worship. The Master took a handful of hairs from his head and gave it to the deva. The latter enshrined it respectfully in a thūpa which he built at the place where the Master had sat. After the passing away of the Buddha, the thera Sarabhi, a disciple of the thera Sāriputta, brought the collar-bone of the Buddha and deposited it in the same thūpa. Later Uddhacūlābhaya, the son of king Devānampiyatissa's brother, saw the wondrous cetiya and covered it over afresh and made it thirty cubits high. Still later, king Dutthagāmaṇi, dwelling there while he made war upon the Danilas, built a mantle cetiya over it eighty cubits high.¹

When the extraordinary elements of this account are removed, we find a foundation of historical truth, namely, that long before Mahinda's day there ^{were} at least ^{a few} some Buddhist monks in Ceylon and that this cetiya was built by them.

1. Mv 1.37 foll.

Nor can one with regard to the question at hand, ignore the arrival in succession of a large number of people from India, among whom, it is difficult to believe, there were no Buddhists.

In order to perform the consecration of Vijaya, the ministers sent an embassy to Madhurā requesting the Pāṇḍyan king to send his daughter to be the queen of Vijaya. In due course she was sent along with many maidens, craftsmen and a thousand families of the eighteen guilds.¹ 'Now these Pāṇḍyans were originally a Kṣatriya race of Āryans from the Maṅgala-desa, the scene of Buddha's lifelong ministry. After they had left their original home in their wanderings southwards they kept in touch with those whom they had left behind. It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that the Pāṇḍyan families carried over with them to Ceylon some knowledge of the Buddha and his teachings.'²

The arrival of Princess Bhaddakaccānā³ and her ~~return~~, too, brings us to the same, or, at least in fact, a more decisive conclusion. Bhaddakaccānā was the youngest daughter of Paṇḍu, the Sakyan, a cousin of the Buddha. 'She was (even as) a woman made of gold, fair of form and eagerly wooed. For (love of) her did seven kings send precious gifts to the king (Paṇḍu), but for fear of the kings, as since he was told (by soothsayers) that an auspicious journey

1. Mv 7.48 foll
2. P.L.C. 17
3. Mv 8.20

would come to pass, nay, one with the result of royal son consecration, he placed his daughter speedily upon a ship, together with thirty-two women friends, and launched the ship upon the Ganges, saying: 'Whosoever can, let him take my daughter.' And they could not overtake her, but the ship fared swiftly thence. Already on the ²²second day they reached the haven called Gopagāmaka and there they landed robed like nuns (pabbajitā).¹

Here two facts support our view. First, she is said to be very closely related to the ^UBuddha, and one may rightly infer that she and her friends were not all ignorant of the teachings of their royal kinsman. Indeed, we would not be far wrong if we take for granted that they, and ^{at}least Bhaddakaccāna and some of her friends, were followers of the Buddha. Secondly, we are told they came disguised as nuns (pabbajitā). Though, as noted before, it is not possible to say definitely what was meant by pabbajitā, considering the locality ~~whence~~ from which they came and their connections with the Buddha's family, it is very likely that this word signified Buddhist bhikkhunis.

As shown in the preceding pages, there lived in pre-Mahindian Ceylon people belonging to almost every religious sect then existing in India. Even Kṣivakas who were, by no means, so numerous as the followers of the Buddha are mentioned as living in Ceylon. How then is one to account for the

absence of any mention of Buddhists ? The only explanation possible is that silence was observed with regard to their existence in order to create a dark background on the canvas on which the enthusiastic narrator of Buddhist history might successfully paint his glowing picture of Mahinda's miraculous conversion of the island.

Again, when we consider how rapidly the conversion of Ceylon took place, it is difficult to believe that the people were, till then, entirely ignorant of the teaching. After the very first discourse of Mahinda forty thousand people including the king embraced the Buddhist faith. His other discourses, too, were equally successful.

Altho~~ugh~~ these facts help us to conclude that Buddhism did exist in Ceylon before the time of Mahinda, ^{though} it was only after Devānampiyatissa's conversion that it became the state religion of ^{the country} Ceylon. Moreover, it may be justly said that Mahinda's mission had ~~this~~ as its chief aim not the mere introduction of the teachings of the Buddha to Ceylon but the formation of the monastic order and thereby the 'establishment' of the ~~nissana~~ in the island.

1. See also J.R.A.S. (C.B.) 1929 p 2832.

CHAPTER II

+-----+

The Advent of Mahinda.

The history of Ceylon assumes a less nebulous and more trustworthy character with the arrival of Mahinda two hundred and thirty six years after the passing away of the Buddha.¹ The details of the advent of this great missionary are given only in the two Ceylon Chronicles and in the Samantapāsādikā. No mention of it is made in any of the Edicts of Asoka discovered so far, though in his thirteenth Edict, Ceylon is mentioned as one of the many countries in which conquests by the Dhamma had been made by him.

As pointed out by Prof. Rhys Davids,² the truth of the Ceylon Chronicles with regard to the mission sent during Asoka's reign to the Himalayan region is confirmed in a striking manner by the archaeological discoveries made at Sāñchi. If the Chronicles were so accurate with regard to this mission which took place in a region where the Sinhalese had hardly any interest, it is justifiable to suppose that the account of Mahinda's mission to Ceylon is more than mere legend. One must, of course, allow a sufficiently wide margin for the later amplifications and exaggerations that must have

1. Sup I 73

2. Buddhist India pp 299 foll.

naturally crept in as a result of literary embellishment and the desire to provide religious edification. This allowance should be made not only in this particular instance but also in the numerous other instances in the Chronicles as well as in the Atthakathās where supernatural phenomena are recorded.

The Samantapāsādikā
Account of Mahinda's
Advent.

The description given in the Samantapāsādikā agrees, though not often in the order of narration, in the main points with the Mahāvamsa account.

Probably both accounts were obtained from the same original source.

After the third Council at Patna (Pāṭaliputta) Mahinda was requested by his preceptor and the sangha to visit Ceylon and establish the sāsanā in that island.¹ After consideration Mahinda concluded that it was not yet the proper time to go there. Maṅgala (307-247 B.C.), the then reigning monarch of Ceylon, was advanced in years and it was not possible to establish the sāsanā under his patronage. Awaiting the accession of Maṅgala's son Devānampiyatissa to the throne, Mahinda set out from Asokārāma with the theras Itthiya, Uttiya, Sambala, Bhaddasāla, the novice Sumana and the lay disciple Bhadduka to pay a visit to his relatives. Mahinda, in due course, arrived at and lived for one month at

1. Sup I 69 foll.

Vedisagiri, the residential quarters of his mother.

Devānampiyatissa

and Asoka.

By this time the death of

Mutasiva had occurred and his son
Tissa was anointed king over Ceylon.

There existed strong ties of friendly affection between Devānampiyatissa and Dhammāsoka, though they had never seen each other. It is said that when Tissa ascended the throne many precious jewels sprang up to the surface of the earth as a result of his previous merit.¹ These he sent as a gift to Asoka. The latter, in return, sent to Tissa the five ensigns of royalty and other things necessary for the consecration of a king. He sent not only these material gifts but also the gift of the Dhamma.² His message ran : "I have taken refuge in the Buddha, the Dhamma and the Sangha, and I have declared myself a lay disciple in the religion of the Son of the Sakiyas. Take delight, even thou, in these ~~Murmas~~ three, in the Supreme Religion of the Conqueror, and come to the Refuge with faith." When Devānampiyatissa received the message and gifts from Asoka, he performed a ~~second~~ consecration on the full-moon day of Vesakha.³

This description, it may be noted, does not agree in all details, with what is given in the Mahāvamsa and the Dipavamsa.⁴ The Mahāvamsa adds that Asoka, not finding in

1. Smp I 74

2. Ibid. I 76

3. Ibid. I 76

4. Mv 11.vv.8 foll.; Dip 11 vv 14 foll

his possession such precious things as were sent to him by Devānampiyatissa, conferred titles and ranks of honour on Ariṭṭha and others who brought him the gifts.¹ Further, the Samantapāsādikā, after giving the description of Tissa's gift and Asoka's return gift, quotes the Dipavaṃsa as the authority for the same.² But the corresponding Dipavaṃsa verses differ considerably from these quotations.³

Arrival
of Mahinda

After spending one month at Vēdisagiri, on the full-moon day of Jetthamūla (April: May or May: June) Mahinda and the other six mentioned above, coming together, discussed whether it was the right time to go to Ceylon.⁴ Then Indra, who in Pāli Buddhist literature is better known as Sakka, the chief (Indra) of the gods, approached Mahinda, requested him to go over and promised his help in the conversion of the island.⁵ This deity, as we shall see later, plays a prominent part in the Buddhist legends of Ceylon. Mahinda, so the story goes, accepted his ^{request} ~~word~~ and, accompanied by the other six, ^{rose} ~~spareng~~ up from the mountain Vedisaka to the sky and stood on the Maṃsakapabbata, which lies to the east of Anurādhapura and which in later days was known by the name Cetiyapabbata.

1. Mv 11 vv. 25, 26

2. Snp I 74, 75

3. Dip. 11 vv 15-17, 32-34

4. Snp I 70

5. Ibid. 71

Tissa meets

Mahinda

This day happened to be the festival day taxsya, known as the Jettamula-nakhatta.¹ We have no other evidence to prove or disprove the truth of this coincidence of events, but we may note that it is quite a natural tendency to associate important events of a new religion with outstanding dates of an older period. The king, on that day, proclaimed the festival and accompanied by forty thousand men set forth to Missakapabbata to enjoy the pleasures of the chase. Following a robha² deer, Tissa climbed the mountain and came to the spot where the theras were. Mahinda, seeing that the king was approaching him, called out: "Come here, Tissa." At this the king was surprised and harboured a doubt as to whether the kk there was a human being or not.³ The Mahāvamsa tells us that this doubt did not leave the king until he had had a private talk with Bhaddu just before he left for the city in the evening.⁴ Mahinda had a conversation with Tissa, during which he gauged the intellectual capacity of the latter.⁵ Finding that the king was quick-witted and able to understand the Dhamma, he expounded the Cūlahatthipadopama Sutta.⁶ At the end of the discourse the king and his retinue of forty thousand people embraced the new faith.

This sounds a miraculous conversion. But if we

1. Smp I 73

2. Mv 14.3 calls it a gokanna

3. Smp I 74

4. Mv 14 vv 29-31

5. Smp I 77 ; Mv 14 vv 16 foll

6. M I pp 175-184

take forty thousand not literally but simply to mean a large number, and when we remember that, as was shown in the preceding chapter, Buddhism was known earlier in Ceylon, we may well take this seemingly sudden conversion to be but a formal and public declaration of the faith to which many in that gathering had hitherto adhered ~~adhered~~ but only in a private capacity.

In the evening meals were brought to the king. Even as he listened to the Sutta, the king knew that taking meals at that time was unlawful to the theras. But thinking that it was unseemly for him to partake of the food without inviting the theras, he invited them. The invitation was, of course, not accepted.

The king ~~then~~ departed to the city and made arrangements to receive the theras on the morrow. Mahinda and those who came with him spent the night on the Missaka Mountain, and on the same night Bhaddu was received into the Order. Many miraculous things are stated to have happened during that night as also during the days that followed. But the descriptions of these preternatural occurrences need not obscure from our sight the historical kernel that lies within this legendary matter. Legends do not arise out of nothing. The greater the number of legends that grow round a person or an event, the more does it point to the great personality of that individual or the deep impression that that event had created in the minds of the people at ~~that~~ ~~that~~ the time.

Entry into
the Capital.

On the following morning Mahinda and the other bhikkhus went to Anurādhapura. The king ordered seats to be prepared for them inside the palace. It is said that ~~that~~ the soothsayers, when they saw the seats prepared, foretold: "The earth is occupied by these (bhikkhus), they will be lords upon this island Tambapanni".¹ The king went forward to meet the theras, and, with due greetings and respect, led them into the palace. Mahinda, seeing the manner in which the seats were spread, took his seat, thinking to himself that the religion would be well established and would take root in the whole of Lanka. The king served the theras with dainty dishes, and calling upon the five hundred ladies, with Amuladevi at their head, to make obeisance to the theras, himself took his seat on a side. After the meal was over, Mahinda preached the *Petavatthu*, *Vimānavatthu* and *Saccasamyutta*² to the people assembled including the king. Hearing this discourse, the five hundred ladies attained the Fruition of the First Path.

The people who saw the theras at Nissakapabbata on the previous day, conveyed the news to their neighbours and this resulted in a vast multitude of people assembling at the gate of the palace.³ But as they had no opportunity to see

1. Snp I 79

2. The *Petavatthu* and *Vimānavatthu* are books in the *Muddaśānikāya*, and the *Saccasamyutta* is a section of the *Samyuttanikāya* (Vol V pp 414 - 478)

3. Snp I 80

the theras the people raised a cry. The king learning what they desired, ordered the hall of the ~~State~~ state elephant to be decorated, and prepared to receive the theras. Mahinda went there and preached the Devadūta Suttanta.¹ At the end of the discourse one thousand² beings attained the Fruition of the First Path.

The elephant's hall, too, soon became insufficient and seats were prepared in the park Mandanavana at the southern gate of the city. The thera went there and preached the Āsi-visopama Sutta.³ On hearing the teaching another thousand persons attained the Sotāpattihala. Thus on the second day after Mahinda's arrival, two thousand and five hundred beings attained the realization of the Truth.

From the facility with which Mahinda and the people of Ceylon understood one another, we may incidentally observe how closely allied the languages in Ceylon and in North India at that time must have been. A comparison of the earliest inscriptions of Ceylon and those of North India in the corresponding age leads one to the same inference.

Gift of the
Park Meghavana.

Even as the thera was conversing
in the Mandanavana with numbers of
ladies of noble families who came to
see him, the day drew to its close.

Mahinda, observing the time, rose up from his seat to go to the

1. A I pp 138-142

2. Five hundred, one thousand, ten thousand, sixteen thousand, eighty-four thousand etc., often occur in Pāli books. Evidently these are not to be taken literally, but as representing large numbers of different degrees.

3. Mv gives it as the Bālapaṇḍita Suttanta (Mv. 15.4)

Misakka Mountain. The ministers, learning the intention of the thera, informed the king, and with the permission of the latter, requested the theras to spend the night at Nandanavana, but they did not accept the request. Then again, the ministers, being ordered by the king, invited the theras to Mangga Meghavana, a park which was neither too far away from nor too close to the town. The theras accepted the invitation and spent the night there. In the morning the king went to Meghavana and bestowed the park on the thera. The grant of this gift was followed by miraculous happenings.¹ One can understand the significance given to this gift as it marked the beginning of the establishment of the Mahāvihāra which became the leading monastery in Ceylon during many centuries that followed.

On the following day, the third one from his arrival, Mahinda preached the Anamataggiya² Discourse.³ On the fourth⁴ day was preached the Aggikhandhapaṇa Sutta.⁵ Seven days were thus spent, converting the multitudes to the faith and helping many in the realization of the Truth. On the seventh day the thera preached the Mahāppanāda Sutta⁶ to the king and returned to Cetiyagiri. According to the Mahāvamsa, Mahinda returned on the thirteenth day of the bright half of

1. Snp I 81

2. S II pp 178-193

3. Mv Snp I 81. The Mahāvamsa states that this Sutta was preached on the fourth day. (Mv 15.186)

4. Second day according to Mv 15.176

5. A IV pp 128-135

6. There are several Suttas bearing this title. See Geiger's Mahāvamsa translation p31 note 3 and p 114 note 2.

the month ~~Āpāḍha~~ Āsāḍha (May : June or June: July) ¹. The reason that caused the theras to return was the approach of the ^(vassa) vassa season , and as the bhikkhus start the vassa period on the full-moon day of Āsāḍha, the Mahāvagga account seems to be the more accurate of the two. From the eager manner in which Mahinda exhorted the king to be diligent (appamāda), the latter suspected that the thera was getting ready to depart from the island. One may here recall the words of the Buddha "vayadhammā bhikkhave saṅghārā, 'appamādena' sampādettha," addressed to his disciples just before his passing away. Devānampiyatissa made haste to Cetiyaḡiri and inquired about the intentions of the thera. Mahinda explained to the king that he was not intending to leave the island, but that during the vassa period bhikkhus had to stay in one place and hence his retreat to the mountain.

Ariṭṭha enters
the Order.

On that day the minister,

Ariṭṭha, entered the Order with fifty-five² of his elder and younger brothers (bhātuka saddhim) and became

Arahanta immediately. There seems to be a confusion with regard

1. ~~Mv xxxix~~ 16.vv 2,3.

2. Fifty-five, it must be noted, is a common round number in Pāli literature. For example, when Sopaka went to Veluvana, fifty-five young brāhmanas accompanied him (Mv 5.115); the pork-butchers at Rājagaha carried on his cruel occupation for fifty-five years (DhA I 125); the Jātaka Commentary is known better in Ceylon by its traditional name "Book of the 550 (i.e. ten times fifty-five) Jātakas", though it does not contain that exact number of stories. Again, the word bhātā or bhātuka used in the passage, has a

to the name Arittha. It appears on several occasions in the Mahāvamsa and in the Samantapāsādikā.

1. The embassy that conveyed the presents from Devānampiyatissa to Asoka was headed by Mahā-Arittha, who was the king's nephew and Prime Minister (bhāsinayavāsiṭṭha Mahārittha amācayā nāyakkha), and on whom the rank of a Commander in the Army (Senaratiṭṭha) was bestowed by Asoka.¹

2. On the seventh day² after Mahinda's advent, a minister, Arittha by name (Arittha nāma amācayā), entered the Order with fifty-five of his brothers. This is the reference that was dealt with in a previous paragraph.

3. When Amula expressed the desire to enter the Order, Tissa, at the behest of Mahinda, sent his nephew Arittha (Arittha nāma attano bhāsinayavāsi) to fetch the therī Saṅghamittā.³ The choice of this envoy was made by Tissa after due consideration with his ministers. It is reasonable to suppose that Arittha was chosen because he had previous experience of going to the court of Asoka. The Mahāvamsa calls him "nephew

significance wider than that of the English word 'brother'. The former can and often does include sons of paternal uncles. The Sinhalese have gone still further and understand by the term sahadara (uterine brother) not only one's "uterine" brothers but also the male first cousins either on the maternal or the paternal side.

1. Mv. 11. vv 20, 25

2. ~~ixxxx~~ that is, according to the Samantapāsādikā version.

3. Sap I 90; Mv. 18.3

Mahā-Ariṭṭha ". Hence we can safely identify this Ariṭṭha with the Mahā-Ariṭṭha (No.1.). Further, as he did not return to Ceylon till the month of Maggasira ¹ (Oct; Nov. or Nov; Dec.) he cannot be the same as the Ariṭṭha (No 2), who, as we know, entered the Order either in the month of Jetṭhamāsa (according to the Samantapāsādikā) or in the month of Kāṭṭhā (according to the Mahāvamsa).

4. This same Ariṭṭha (i.e. same as No.3), after his return from India, entered the Order along with five hundred men and became Arhants.² Here, too, he is called the king's nephew (rañño bhasineyyo).

5. In the Vinaya recital that took place during Devānāpiyatissa's reign, Mahā-Ariṭṭha ³ played somewhat the same part as Upāli did in the first council at Rājagaha.

From the facts given above it is clear that there were two Ariṭṭhas, both ministers, and both nephews of the king. One (Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 5) was Mahā-Ariṭṭha and the other (No 2) was Ariṭṭha . One may even go a step further and suggest that they were brothers. It was quite a common custom to give the same name to two sons and differentiate one from the other by adding the prefix Mahā- (the Great or the Elder) to the elder's name.

1.Snp I 98: Mv 19.24

2.Snp I 101

3.Ibid I 103. The variant ^{reading} No.11 as Mahā-Ariṭṭha instead of Ariṭṭha on Snp I 102 appears to be the correct one.

Now to return to the main subject. After Arittha and his brothers entered the Order, Tissa caused the construction of the sixty-eight caves (~~ṣaṭṭhiṣṭhi~~ (atthasatthi lana) at Cetiyagiri to be started and returned to Anurādhapura. The theras spent the first vassa at Cetiyagiri. At that time there were sixty-two Arhants who spent the vassa there.¹ Dr G.C.Mendis draws attention to the parallel between this account and the Mahāvagga account of the Buddha's first vassa in which also there were sixty-two Arhants including the Buddha.² With reference to the Mahāvassa and the Samantapāsādikā accounts of Mahinda's first vassa. Dr Mendis remarks : "The number of arahants in Ceylon was really sixty-three. Perhaps it was made sixty-two to make it similar to the Mahāvagga account." It may also be added that sixty-two is another round number which is very commonly used in Pāli literature.

After spending the vassa period the thera ~~ascent~~ acquainted the king with his desire of getting a thūpa built, containing the bodily relics of the Buddha. This led to the erection of the Thupārāma Dāgāba .³ During the course of the construction of the thūpa , Abhaya, a brother of king Devānampiyatissa, entered the Order along with a thousand men. Five hundred young men from the village Cetāli became monks and a like number from each village such as Dvāramapāli. The number

1. Snp I 83

2. "A Historical Criticism of the Mahāvassa". Thesis (Ms) in the London University Library. pp 175,176.

3. This question will be dealt with in another connection later.

of monks thus became thirty thousand.¹

Whatever be the significance of these figures, there is no doubt that the religion spread rapidly in the island. The fact that Mahinda was of royal blood and closely connected with the Emperor Asoka, whom we have reason to suppose was highly respected in Ceylon, the conversion of Tissa, the respect that he continued to show to Mahinda, the entering into the monkhood of eminent men in the royal family ^{such} as the two Ariṣṭha and Abhaya - all these must have contributed in no small measure to the propagation of the faith.

The king's sister-in-law, Amulā, who had already become a Gotapanna was now desirous of joining the Order of Buddhist nuns. Mahinda could not confer pabbajjā on her as, according to the Vinaya, that could be done only by a bhikkhunī. Mahinda, therefore, asked the king to send a message to his sister Saṅghamittā to come over to Ceylon and establish the bhikkhunī sāsaṇa (the Order of Buddhist nuns).²

Bringing of

the Bodhi Tree.

As was referred to before,

the message was forthwith sent by

Devānampiyatissa through Ariṣṭha. The

latter was also asked to bring a branch

of the Bodhi Tree under which the Buddha attained Enlightenment.³

1. Mv 17.59-61

2. Snp I 90

3. Ibid I 90

The manner in which Asoka severed the branch from the sacred tree, how it was sent to Ceylon, and how Devānampiyatissa accepted it are all described with legendary details in the Mahāvamsa¹ and in the Samantapāsādikā². To watch over the Bodhi Tree Asoka sent³ eighteen khattiya families (devakālāni) and eight families each of ministers, brāhmanas, householders (puttūbhikkhū⁴), cowherds and also eight each of the Tamasas⁵ and Kaliga⁵ tribes. The Mahāvamsa adds to the list eighteen families from the weavers, potters, from all the guilds (sappi) and from the Nāgās and the Yakkhas.⁶

The place where it was planted at Anurādhapura is said to be the sacred spot on which stood the southern branches of the Bodhi Trees of the three previous Buddhas.⁷ People from many parts of the country were present at the ceremony of planting the tree.⁸ Saplings grown from the seeds of this tree were planted near the port at Jambukola, at the gate of the village of the brāhmana Tavakka (or Tivakka), at Thupāraṇa, Issaranimāṇavihāra, Paṭhamacetiya, ^TUtiyapabbata, Kāsaragama and Candagāma^{na} in the district of Rohana and in thirty-two other places at a distance of one

1.Mv 18.23 foll.

2.Snp I 92 foll.

3.Ibid.I 96

4.Mv 19.2 has 'traders' (setthi)

5.See Mv Translation p 128. note 2

6.Mv 19.3

7.Snp I 99

8.Ibid.100.

that
 yojana from one another.¹ From this day up to the present,
 the Buddhists in Ceylon have paid and are paying the utmost
 reverence to this branch of the Bodhi Tree under the shade of
 which the Master received his Enlightenment. In the words of
 Paul E. Pieris : "It is doubtful if any other single incident
 in the long history of their race has seized upon the imagin-
 ation of the Sinhalese with such tenacity as this of the
 painting of the aged tree. Like its pliant roots, which find
 sustenance on the face of the bare rock and cleave their way
 through the stoutest fabric, the influence of what it represents
 has penetrated into the innermost being of the people till the
 tree itself has become almost human." ²

Some scholars have doubted the historicity of
 this tree on the ground that there is no external evidence to
 corroborate the Ceylon tradition. Geiger firmly upholds the
 tradition. He remarks : "The narrative of the transplanting of
 a branch of the sacred Bodhi-tree from Uruvelā to Ceylon finds
 interesting confirmation in the monuments. At least, Grindwedel,
 in an ingenious and, to me, convincing way, points out that
 the sculptures of the lower and middle architraves of the East
 Gate of the Sāñchi Tops are representations of that event. Since
 the Sāñchi-sculptures belong to the second century B.C. the
 representation is distant from the event by roughly speaking ,
 only 100⁴ or at most 150 years.³ ^{Davidson} Rhys has expressed the same
 opinion.⁴

1. Smp I 100

3. Mv Trans. Intr. p xx.

4. Buddhist India p 302

2. P. E. Pieris: Ceylon and the Portu-
 guese pp 3, 4. quoted in
 P. L. C. p 24.

Besides planting the branch of the Bodhi Tree, Tissa did much else that was beneficial to the religion. His meritorious works included the building of the Mahāvihāra, Caityavihāra and Thuparāma, the enshrining of the collar-bone of the Buddha, the erecting of Issarasamanavihāra, Jambukola in Nāgadiipa, Tissamahāvihāra, Pacinārāma and the two nunneries Upāsilavihāra and Hatthābhakavihāra.¹

Having accomplished all this for the propagation of the sāsaṇa, Tissa asked Mahinda whether the sāsaṇa was established in the island.² The latter replied: "Great king, the sāsaṇa is established but it has not taken root." Being questioned further as to when and how it would take root, Mahinda explained: "When a person born of parents who belong to Tambapannidīpa, enters pabbajjā in Tambapannidīpa, learns the Vinaya in Tambapannidīpa, and recites the same in Tambapannidīpa, then will the sāsaṇa take root in the land." The

The Vinaya

Recital.

bhikkhu, Mahā-Arittha, possessed all these qualifications and arrangements were promptly made for a recital of the Vinaya. A pavilion was erected on the spot where the parivara of the minister Maṅghavannābhaya stood. The description is modelled on that of the first council held at Rājagaha. Sixty-eight mahātheras, each having a following of thousand bhikkhus assembled at Thuparāma. A basic difference, however, should be noted

1. Mv 20.17foll.

2. Snp I 102

between this council and the one at Rājagaha. The latter was assembled to codify and arrange the Vinaya and the Dhamma, whereas the object of the Thupāraṃa Council was the teaching of Vinaya by a Sinhalese bhikkhu. Thus Mahā-Arīttha assumed the rôle of a Vinaya teacher and five hundred bhikkhus with Maṭṭabhaya there, a younger brother of the king, received the teaching. The king, too, with his retinue (saṅghika ca parisa) was present at the recital, a feature which was absent in the first Council.

The sāmaṇa was thus firmly established and well-rooted in the island. Following the lead given by members of the royal family thousands entered the Order. Mahinda, needless to say, well deserved the epithet often applied to him, 'Pīṇaprasādako' (he who made the island bright). About seven ^{Pāli} hundred years later the compiler of the Itivuttaka Commentary on the Itivuttaka records that even up to his day those who joined the Order did so following the footsteps of Mahā-Mahinda there.¹

A few words should also be said in this connection with regard to the establishment of the Bhikkhunī-sāmaṇa or the Order of Buddhist nuns. Awaiting the arrival of Saṅghamittā, Amulā and many ladies who followed her example, took upon themselves the observance of the ten precepts (dasā aṭṭhāni) and lived in a nunnery specially

1. ItA 259. Also see SA Sn III 125

built for them.¹ When Saṅghamittā arrived they entered the Order under her and within a short time became Arahants.²

According to the Dipavaṃsa a large number of bhikkhunis accompanied Saṅghamittā from India. They were Uttarā, Hemā, Paśādapālā, Aggimittā, Dāsikā, Phaggā, Pabbatā, Mattā, Mallā, Dhammadiyā,³ Mahādevī, Padumā, Hemissā, Unnālā, Anjalī and Sumā.⁴ All these bhikkhunis taught the Vinaya Piṭaka and the Doctrine at Anurādhapura. The first ten in this list were young (ībhara bhikkhuniyo) when they came to the island.⁵ Those who received ordination in Ceylon included Saddhammanandī, Somā, Giriddhī, Dāsīyā, Dhamaññā, Dhammapālā, Mahilā, Sobhanā, Dhammatapassā, Naramittā, Sātā, Kālī and Uttarā.⁶ If there is any historical truth in these records, they show us the success which the Bhikkhuni-sāsana had at its very inception in Ceylon.⁷

The nunnery in which Anulā and her friends lived, awaiting the arrival of Saṅghamittā, was known as the Upāsikā-vihara. Later Saṅghamittā, too, lived here with her company of nuns. In this place she caused twelve buildings to be erected, of which three were more important than the rest. The mast, the rudder and the helm of the ship that brought the branch of the Bodhi Tree were kept, one in each, in these three

-
1. Snp. I. 91
 2. Ibid. I. 101
 3. Dip. 18. vv. 11, 12
 4. Ibid. 18. 24
 5. Ibid. 18. 70, 12
 6. Ibid. 18. 14-16

7. It should however be mentioned that these records are in a confused state. The Dipavaṃsa seems to have had linked together several lists of names of bhikkhunis without paying due regard to a chronological order.

buildings and, therefore, they came to be known as the Kinnayatthi-
thanita-shara , Piya-thanita-shara and Arittha-thanita-shara
respectively. Even when, in later days, other sects such as
the Dhammarucika arose, these twelve buildings were always
used by the Hatthāḷhaka bhikkhus.¹ The Mahāvamsa gives a
detailed account of the reasons that led to the building of the
Hatthāḷhaka nunnery.² This account explains how the dwellers
of the Upāsāḷikā-vihāra came by the name Hatthāḷhaka.³

Passing away
of Mahinda
and Saṅgha-
mittā.

Devānampiyatissa reigned

for forty years and on his death was
succeeded by his brother Uttiya. In
the eighth year of his reign Mahinda,
who was sixty years old from the date
of his upasampadā ordination, passed

away on the eighth day of the bright half of the month Asāyujā,
while he was spending the rainy season on the Cetiya Mountain.⁴
If, as is customary, Mahinda obtained upasampadā ordination
at the age of twenty, he must have come to Ceylon at the age
of thirty-two and died at the age of eighty. The ^{pa} pirinibbāna
of Saṅghamittā, too, took place in the following year while she
dwelt in the Hatthāḷhaka vihāra.⁵

1. Mv 19.68-71

2. Ibid. 19.72-83

3. Ibid. p 134 note 2 (in Geiger's translation)

4. Ibid. 20.32,33

5. Ibid. 20.48,49

The great ²thera passed away from the world of mortals but the memory of his name lives fresh to this day in the minds of the people of the land, for the welfare of which he dedicated his whole life. Even today thousands of devout pilgrims wend their way up the flight of eighteen hundred and more steps hewn out of solid rock to the sacred spot where the ²thera lived. The mountain is called Mihintale (Mahinda-thala) and the cave in which he lived is known as Mihindu-guhā (Mahinda-guha). A short distance below the peak is to be seen a slab of rock which tradition identifies with the bed of Mahinda. And even at present, on the full-moon day of Poeson (Jettham) is held the annual religious festival Maha Mahinda Puttaya (the festival of the Great Mahinda) to commemorate the advent of the royal missionary to Ceylon.

CHAPTER III

The Spread of the Faith.

In the last chapter we saw how the sāṣana was firmly established in the island under the royal patronage of Devānampiyatissa. Once deeply rooted it began to grow and extend rapidly in every direction. In a few months it reached such southern localities as Kācaragāma and Candanagāma in Rohana.¹ The success with which it spread and found a happy home in the country was so remarkable that it came to be believed that the land was made fit for human habitation by the Buddha himself, for 'Lankā was known to the Conqueror as a place where his doctrine should (thereafter) shine in glory'.² During the next few centuries instances are not wanting of people coming to Ceylon from India to lead the higher life. Viśākha, a rich householder of Patna, made his journey to Ceylon and entered the Order at the Mahavihāra. He had heard the report: "The Tambapanni Island (Ceylon) is adorned with garlands of shrines, is resplendent with yellow robes. There one may sit or lie down in any place one likes. Agreeable weather, suitable dwellings, agreeable men - all these are easy to get there."³ In another preference Anurādhapura is

1. Mv 19.vv 54,62

2. Ibid. 1.20

3. Vī I 312; P.P. II 359

described as being as suitable to one who leads the monastic life as India was in the time of the Buddha.¹

The triumph of conversion was achieved during the reign of Devānampiyatissa, and the later kings, with the exception of only a few, did all they could to make that triumph lasting.

The successor of Devānampiyatissa was Uttiya (207-197 B.C.)². As pointed out elsewhere, it was during the

this reign that Mahinda and Saṅghamittā entered Uttiya.

parinibbāna. The Samaññatapāsādikā gives the names of Tissadatta, Kālasumana and Digha-
su sumana as pupils of Mahā-Aritṭha, and we would not be wrong in supposing that they lived during the reign of this monarch. The there Digha or Dighanaga, too, was very likely a contemporary.³ The name of Tissadatta occurs several times in the Commentaries. If the allusions are to one and the same person, he was noted for his recollectedness of mind⁴ and as one who was master of eighteen languages.⁵ Analytic insight came to him as a result of his wide learning;⁶ and he had the iddhi power of minimising distance in time and space.⁷ We have no records of Uttiya's contribution to the welfare of the sāsaṇa except that of his building thūpas enshrining relics of Mahinda and Saṅghamittā

1. Vī I 91

2. MV 20.29

3. Sap I 62, 104

4. EV 275; Pap I 290; Man II 54

5. EV 387

6. Ibid 387 389

7. Vī II 403

Sūratissa and
the First Ta-
mil invasion.

Uttiya was succeeded by his brother
Mahāsiva (197-187 B.C.) and the latter by
his brother Sūratissa (187-177 B.C.).

Sūratissa was a pious monarch and had the welfare of the sāma at his heart. He built many viharas at and near Anurādhapura.¹ But his reign was to witness the first of many foreign invasions which threatened the peace of the country from time to time. The country, favoured as well by the richness of the soil as by the persevering industry of the inhabitants, had progressed for three centuries. This prosperity attracted the envious eyes of the Tamil of South India and we find Samsa and Uttika, two Tamil merchants, determined and powerful, making an attack on Sūratissa, defeating him and taking possession of his territory.² These two reigned righteously, usurpers though they were, for twenty-two years. No records of the happenings of these dark years are available to us, but there is not the least doubt that with the assuming of the control of the government by these non-believers there appeared a cloud of gloom in the firmament of the newly established sāma.

Samsa and Uttika were in turn overpowered by Anela, a son of Mahāsiva. If we are to accept the Mahāvamsa chronology he was more than ninety years old when he ascended the throne. Ten years later came, at the head of

1. Mv 21.3 foll.

2. Ibid. 21.10 foll.

a large army, Elāra , another Dravidian from the Coja country. Asala, now a centenarian, though perhaps still young in courage and determination, proved no match for the powerful invader. He was killed in battle and Elāra became king. The latter

Elāra

(145-101 B.C.)

proved to be one of the most just kings Ceylon ever saw. Though himself a pious Hindu, he proved no enemy of Buddhism. Indeed, we have reason to

believe that some of his ministers were Buddhists and probably were Sinhalese too.¹ He helped the bhikkhus and maintained the traditions of the earlier kings of Ceylon.² The Mahāvamsa bestows unstinted praise on the virtues of this monarch.³ But all his followers were not Elāras. They used their power to snatch away whatever they could from the treasures that Anurādhapura then possessed. Yet, though Elāra was a friend of the Buddhists, it was too much to expect his active help for the preservation and the propagation of the faith. Moreover, the independent spirit of the Sinhalese people would not long brook a foreign sway. But as they were not powerful enough to defeat Elāra , many of the Sinhalese left Anurādhapura and went to Rohana, awaiting better times to assert their rights.

1. As may be inferred from Mv 21.23

2. Mv 21.21

3. Ibid. 21.14 foll.

Rohana

Let us now leave Amurādhapura for a moment and turn our eyes towards Rohana .

At the time when Elāra was in power at Amurādhapura , there was reigning in Rohana a devout but somewhat timid king, Kakavannatissa by name, a direct descendant of prince Mahānāga, brother of king Devānampiyatissa.

Mahānāga was the vice-regent under Devānampiyatissa and was dearly loved by the latter. A plot on the life of Mahānāga was made by the queen who feared that he and not her son would be the heir to the throne after Devānampiyatissa's death. The scheme failed and Mahānāga fled to Rohana with his family and retinue. There he established his capital at Mahāgāma and ruled over the whole of Rohana . He founded many vihāras such as the Nāgasmahāvihāra and the Uddhakandarakavihāra.¹ The Mahānāga dagāba known as Kirivehera at Kataragama (Kācaragāma) is attributed by tradition to this king.² The built building of the dagāba known as Kirivehera at Kataragama (Kācaragāma) is attributed by tradition to this king.³ The Samantapāsādikā refers to a king Mahānāga who went abroad with his brother and was established on the throne after his return.⁴ The Atthasālinī has the same reference but adds that he continued bestowing gifts of medicine at Panambāngana as long as he lived.⁵

1. Mv 22.9

2. Mv Trans. p 147 note 1

3. Ep.Zey.REEK Vol III p 214

4. Snp II 473

5. Att 399

There was only one other Mahānāga king by the name ^{of} Mahānāga in Ceylon before the time of Buddhaghosa, and that was Mahādāphika Mahānāga. As far as we can see from the Mahāvamsa, there was no occasion for him to go abroad, nor was there any dispute as to his right to the ~~Mahāvamsa~~ throne. On the other hand it is possible that when Mahānāga, the brother of Devānapiyātissa, fled to Rohana he had to fight with the then ruling prince or chieftain there. Probably having been once defeated, he was forced to seek refuge abroad as he could not return to Anurādhapura from which he had already fled.

Passing rapidly over the reigns of his son Yatthalayakatissa and his grandson Gothābhaya we come to Kakkavannatissa of whom reference was made before. It will be recalled that he was Gothābhaya's son and ruled over Rohana from his capital at Māgasa (Mahāgāsa). A touching and interesting account of a poor but faithful man who lived during the reign of this king and who gave a meal, earned with great difficulty, to the then Pindapātiyātissa of Asbariyavibhāra is given in the Manorathapūraṇī. The province of Rohana, on the whole, seems to have been prosperous. While narrating this episode Buddhaghosa remarks that the bhikkhus at that time had no difficulty in obtaining their requisites. Though the conditions in Rohana were satisfactory, it was during this very period

that Kṣāra had made himself master of the country north of the Mahavālī-gaṅga.

Kalyāṇi

In Kalaniya (Kalyāṇi), too, there was ruling at the same time a king by the name of Tissa.¹ The Mahāvamsa and other historical records of Ceylon are silent as to how Kalyāṇi became a separate kingdom. Perhaps when the power of the kings at Anurādhapura was on the wane, an enterprising prince made for himself a small but independent principality in the Māyā-raṭṭha with Kalyāṇi as its capital. Tissa was a Buddhist and Kalyāṇi was already an important Buddhist centre. ~~Kṣāra's daughter~~, known later as Vihāra-mahā-devī, Tissa's daughter Devī, known later as Vihāra-mahā-devī, arrived at Mahāgama by sea after many dramatic experiences and was made the queen of Kāvāpattissa.²

Duttha-
gāmaṇi.

Devī was a woman of extraordinary courage and sagacity. Her heart was burning with patriotism and foreign domination over the greater part of the country galled her bitterly. Two sons, Gāmaṇi and Tissa, worthy of such a noble mother were born to her in due course. Many miraculous incidents are said to have occurred at the birth of Gāmaṇi.³ He grew up with a firm determination to put an

1. Mv 22.13

2. Ibid. 22.13-22

3. Ibid. 22.59 foll.

end to the foreigners' sway. He gradually gathered together a strong army and begged his father for leave to fight with the Tamils. The aged king refused permission, fearing that Elāra was too powerful for his ambitious but young son. Gāmaṇī resented this refusal and leaving his father's roof, made secret preparations for the great task that lay before him. After the death of Kāḍavannatissa he returned to Mahāgama, and aided by the sagacity and farsightedness of his mother, freed the country of the foe. The whole account is given with an abundance of detail in the Mahāvamsa. We shall, however, be concerned here only with the part that Buddhism played in his activities.

From their childhood the two princes were trained to be respectful towards the saṅgha. Once in their early childhood and again when they were twelve and ten years of age respectively they were made to take a solemn promise before a large gathering of the saṅgha that they would never turn away from the bhikkhus.¹ Gāmaṇī's respect towards the bhikkhus was exceedingly great. In a battle which he waged against his brother the latter was defeated and took refuge in a vihāra. Though Gāmaṇī knew that Tissa was there he would not, on account of his respect towards the bhikkhus, lay his hands upon Tissa.² It was a bhikkhu, Godhatissa by name, who appeased the enmity of the two brothers. While granting pardon to

1. Mv 22.78-80

2. Ibid. 24.39

Tissa, Gāmanī is said to have remarked to the bhikkhus : It is known to you that we ^{are} now also your servants. If you had but sent a sāmanera of seven years our strife had not taken place (and all had ended) without loss of men."¹

Gāmanī strictly observed the practice of offering food to the bhikkhus before partaking of his meals.² This he observed even under very trying circumstances. In the war with his brother, once Gāmanī himself was defeated and, with his minister Tissa, took refuge in a jungle. He felt very hungry but when some food brought by Tissa was placed before him, he would not eat it until he had given a portion of it to a bhikkhu. The meal time was proclaimed and the therā Gotama of Piyaṅgulīpa, hearing it, sent the therā Tissa to accept the food.³ Again, during the time of the great famine called the Akkhaṭṭhayaika famine, Gāmanī obtained for two precious earrings a dish of sour millet gruel and gave it to five great theras.⁴ While lying on his death-bed Dutthagāmanī declared that of all gifts given by him these two gladdened his heart most as they were given with disregard for his own life while he was in adversity. Only once had he taken a meal without sharing it with the saṅgha and, as a penance for this omission, he built the Maricavapī-vihāra.⁵ Even when setting out to

1.Mv 24.49 foll.

2.Att 80

3.Mv 24.22 foll. The Manerathapūraṇī (II 212, 213) gives the same account but with more detail. There the therā is called Bodhimātu Mahātissa.

4.Mv 32.29, 30

5.Ibid. 25.115

fight with the Tamils the king took with him five hundred bhikkhus so that he could treat them with honour when he was engaged in battle.¹

Dutthagamani's chief aim was to protect ~~from~~ the religion from the ravages of the Dravidian foe. "Not for the joy of sovereignty" he declared "is this toil of mine; my striving (has been) ever to establish the doctrine of the Sambuddha."² Having once defeated the Tamils and the whole country brought under his sole authority, he devoted his entire time (101 - 77 B.C.) to the improvement of the state of Buddhism in Ceylon.

Maricavatti
vihāra.

His first undertaking was the building of the Maricavaṭṭi-vihāra. As noted before, this vihāra was built by him as a penance for partaking of some long pepper (marica) without giving a share to the bhikkhus. The building of the vihāra was finished in three years. To consecrate the monastery he held a festival. On that occasion a hundred thousand bhikkhus and ninety thousand bhikkhunīs are reported to have been present.³

An interesting account of an incident which occurred on that day and had its consequences later is mentioned in several of the Atthakathās.⁴ A young samānera of seven

1. Mv 25.2

2. Ibid. 25.17

3. Ibid. 26.14 foll.

4. Pap II 145; Pj II 71; GuN1A 79; ApA 128

years received a bowl of hot gruel and was carrying it with difficulty, placing it alternately on the fringe of his rope and on the ground. A sāmaneri saw this and gave him a vessel to serve as a holder. Sixty years later there was a famine¹ in Ceylon and both of them went (separately) to India. The bhikkhuni (formerly sāmaneri) heard that a bhikkhu from Ceylon had arrived and came to see him. On conversation she discovered that he was none other than the sāmanera whom she had met at the festival of the Maricavattivihāra. Mutual love immediately sprang up in their hearts and, though elders of sixty years, they fell from their higher life and committed the parajika offence.

Lohapāsāda.

Dutthagāmaṇi proceeded next to cause an uposathāra or a meeting-hall of the chapter to be built. It is said that the erection of this building was predicted by Mahinda himself and that the plan was made by eight Arahant bhikkhus on the model of a celestial palace.² Desirous of obtaining the full merit for himself, the king proclaimed that no work in connection with the building was to be done by anyone without receiving payment or reward for the same.³ When completed the building consisted of nine storeys, the first being occupied by ordinary bhikkhus, the second by those learned in the three Piṭakas,

1. Very likely the Brāhmapatiśsa famine of Vattagāmaṇi's day.

2. Mv 27.3 fell.

3. Ibid. 27.23

the third, fourth and fifth by those who had attained to the stages of notāpatti, sakadāgāmi and anāgāmi respectively and the four topmost storeys by Arhants.¹ The building was covered over with plates of copper, and hence it received its name Lohapāsāḍa or the 'Brazen Palace'.² The pillars that once supported this magnificent building are still to be seen in their original places at Anurādhapura. The consecration of this vihāra was done with the same grandeur as that of the Maricavattivihāra.

Mahāsthūpa.

The erection of the Mahāsthūpa (now Ruwanwālī-sāya) was, however, the greatest of Duṭṭhagāmaṇi's works. In the building of this, as in the case of the Maricavattivihāra, he issued the proclamation that none should do any work in connection with it without receiving due reward for his or her contribution. The Mahāvamsa and other later literary works have preserved for us many interesting records of the miraculous ways in which Duṭṭhagāmaṇi received the wherewithal to put his plans into execution. Men and gods, bhikkhus and laymen, all had their share in making the work a success.³

The foundation-stone was laid on the full-moon day of the month Vesākha. Many well known theras from abroad are said to have come with their retinues to Anurādhapura on that day : Indagutta from Rājagaha (now Rājgir), Dharmasena

1. Mv 27.44 foll.
 2. Ibid. 27.42
 3. Mv. Ch 28.

from Isipatana (Benares), Piyadassi from Jetavana, Uru-Buddharakkhita from the Mahāvāsa monastery in Vesālī (probably the modern Basār in the District Muzaffarpur), Uru-Dhammarakkhita from the Uposithārāma in Kosambi, UruSaṅgharakkhita from the Dakkhinagiri in Ujjeni (now Ujjain in the Gwalior state), Mittinna from the Asokārāma in Pāṭaliputta (modern Patna), Uttinna from Kashmir, Mahādeva from Pallavabhogga (Persia ?), Yona-Mahā-Dhammarakkhita from Alasandā of the Yona country (probably near Kabul), Uttara from the region of the Vindhyā forest, Cittagutta from Buddhagayā, Candagutta from the Vanavāsa country and Suriyagutta from the Kelāsa-vihāra. As Mahālaṣekara observes, " the Mahāvāsa was here only following an older tradition, and whatever we may feel about the chronicler's statements as to the mode of travel adopted by these distinguished visitors and the numbers of the disciples that formed their retinues (sixty-thousand, etc), there is no gainsaying that this points to a historical event, that these eminent theras did come to Ceylon at the time and that they were men of influence in their various dioceses".¹

The Mahāvāsa gives in detail the objects that were deposited in the relic-chamber of the thūpa . Among them were a golden image of the Buddha, and statues of Māra, Brahmā and many other gods. There were also scenes depicting the Jātakas. The Vesāntara Jātaka was depicted fully.² Here, too,

1.P.L.C. 36
2.MV 30.62fol.

the Mahāvamsa has, no doubt, followed an older tradition, probably an account in the Perāna-Sīhalatthakatha-Mahāvamsa. If we could tell when the tradition originated much light would be thrown on the customs, artistic tastes of the people at that time, ~~the growth of~~ the growth of mythology, the association of Hindu gods with the teachings of the Buddha, and many other such problems.

Dutthagāmaṇi did not live long enough to see the completion of this cetiya, his most stupendous work. He is, moreover, said to have built ninety-nine viharas in all.¹

Dutthagāmaṇi's reign gave birth to a renaissance in every direction. When he ascended the throne, the country had been in a state of political unrest for nearly three-quarters of a century. The frequent inroads made by the Dravidians of South India upon the island tended in every way to diminish the prosperity of the people. This, both directly and indirectly, compelled the people to withhold themselves from their religious and literary activities. Amurādhapura, which was the centre of Buddhist learning and culture, suffered most under the Dravidian invaders. In addition to the disasters wrought by hostile foreigners, Ceylon was visited by a devastating famine. It is not possible to say whether this famine occurred before or after the accession of Gāmaṇi to the throne. The famine was so severe that during it akka rats

1. Mv 32.26

(*Terminalia Bellerica*), which at other times were used as discs, were eaten, and hence it was called the *Abbhakkhāyika* famine.¹ However determined and persevering the bhikkhus may have been, they no doubt had their share of these calamities from within and without. Hence, it should not be a surprise to us if we found that theras at that time went abroad, not content with what they could learn in Ceylon, to prosecute further studies in the Dhamma. The *Samachavini* records such an instance where a thera, Punabbasakurtumbikaputta Tissa by name, went to study under Yonaka Dhammarakkhita thera.²

The state of affairs evidently changed when Gāmanī came to power. His faith in the Buddha, his zeal to propagate the Doctrine, his veneration towards the saṅgha - all these knew no bounds. The Buddha was to him a kinsman, too, whom he affectionately revered and not merely the founder of a faith.³ Many are the interesting episodes that depict these characteristics of the pious monarch. The *Samangalavilāsini* tells us that after his victory over the Tamils, Dutthagāmanī could not sleep for one whole month as a result of his excessive joy. The matter was brought to the notice of the bhikkhus, and, on one night, eight theras chanted the *Sitta Yamaka* of the in the presence of the king the *Citta Yamaka* of the *Abhidhamma Piṭaka*.

1. *MV Trans.* p 222 note 6

2. *SV* 389

3. According to the Mahāvamsa tradition Dutthagāmanī was a direct descendant of the Buddha's paternal uncle Amitodana. See Index to the Mahāvamsa (p.79) by J. Sturges Still, Colombo 1907.

This chanting induced sleep and the king on waking up the following morning exclaimed with joy: "There is no remedy which the children of my grandfather (avvaka ¹) do not know. They know even the medicine that induces sleep", ² Again, having heard that a gift of the Doctrine by preaching was more than a gift of worldly wealth, he made an attempt to preach the Maṅgala Sutta at the Lehapāsāda, but could not do so from reverence for the brotherhood. ³ Fired with all this abundance of zeal, he endeavoured to spread the knowledge of Buddhism in the country by helping the preachers in every manner possible. ⁴ It is also interesting to note incidentally the manner in which he kept an account of his religious activities by recording them in a special book, the maṇipattaka. ⁵ The mention of this fact throws a sidelight, too, on the literary conditions of the period.

This royal munificence produced many a great man in the field of religion. The Mahāvamsa and the Pāli Commentaries have preserved for us the names of, and in some cases episodes relating to, several such well known theras of Duṭṭhagāmaṇi's day.

-
1. This word reminds us of the epithet pitāmaha (grandfather) applied frequently to Mahābrahmā in the Rāmāyana and other Sanskrit works.
 2. Sum VII II 640
 3. Mv 32.vv.42,43
 4. Ibid. 32.44-46 His other activities for the welfare of the sāsaṇa are enumerated in 32.26 foll.
 5. Ibid. 32.25

Among them the two men about whom we have the best information are Dhammadinna there of Talahgaratissa-pabbata in Rohapa and Mā Malayadeva there.

Dhammadinna was an Arahant and Malayadeva.

Dhammadinna

the teacher of a large number of bhikkhus.¹

Many were those who attained Arahantship under his guidance. His fame spread far and wide and the residents at Tissamahārāma, hearing of his greatness, invited him there to give them instructions on the higher life. But Dhammadinna went thither, but his greatness was not understood by them. On his way he disillusioned in a very interesting way two theras, one in Hanḥkanavihāra and the other ~~taxatapahmatavikara~~ in Cittalapabbatavihāra, who were under the false belief that they had attained Arahantship.² In a very similar manner Dhammadinna made his teacher Mahā-nāga there of Uccātalāḥka understand that the latter, too, had not become an Arahant.³ He is, moreover, said to have possessed the iddhi power of showing hells and heavens to his audiences while he was preaching.⁴ He was also one of the five great theras who received the gift, great highly valued by Duṭṭhagāmaṇī, of sour millet-gruel during the Akkhaṇḍikāyika

1. SV 489

2. Pap I 184, 185. A part of the account is given in Man I 42, 43 but with the slight difference that Dhammadinna set out, not alone, but accompanied by bhikkhus (bhikkhusaṃsa parivuto). In SV 489 the names of the two theras are given as Hanḥkanavāsī Mahāḍattakūḍi Nikapannapadhanagharavāsī Cūlasamma .VI II 634 mentions Cūlasamma as a dweller of Nikapannapadhanagara.

3. SV 489

4. W. # 392

famine. Dhammadiṇṇa is said to have shared this gift with many bhikkhus at Piyaṅgulipa. The other four theras were Malayamahādeva, Dhammagutta, Khuddatissa of Maṅgala and Mahāvyaṅga.¹

Malaya
-deva.

The name of Malayadeva is also found as Malayavāsī Mahādeva,² Malimahādeva,³ Maliyadeva,⁴ Mahāmaliya of Kālavela,⁵ and sometimes simply as Mahādeva⁶ or Deva.⁷

As is indicated by the epithet Malayavāsī, he was from Maḍaya, the central mountain-region in the interior of Ceylon.⁸ The Maṇḍarathapurāṇī gives an account of how he was helped by a devout woman at Kallagāma when he was studying at Maṇḍalārāma Mahāvihāra, how he attained Arahanthood and how he delivered a discourse at the end of which that woman attained the First Path.⁹ We are told that he mastered the three Piṭakas within three years of being a bhikkhu.¹⁰

As a preacher the thera was exceedingly successful. The Paṇḍitaśāstrī tells us that he discoursed on the Chachakka Sutta at the Iṇhapāsāda and the Mahāmaṇḍapa at Amarāḍhapura, at Cetiyapabbata, Sākiyavamsavihāra, Kūṭalivihāra,

-
1. Mv 32.49
 2. Vī I 241
 3. J IV 490
 4. Man I 38; Pap Sn 1024
 5. J VI 30
 6. Man I 39
 7. Pap Sn 1025
 8. Mv Trans. p 60 note 4.
 9. Man I 38, 39
 10. Ibid. I 38, 39.

Antarasebbha, Martingana, Vītakaṇṇabba, Pācīnagaraka, Digha-vāpi, Lokandara, Gaṇḍavāla, and Cittalāpabbata; and at each of these places sixty bhikkhus attained Araṇṇasīpa.¹ The description given in the Paṇḍitaśāstrī as to how he bathed with his own hands an aged therā at Cittalāpabbata is very touching.² Whatever the significance of this number sixty may be, there is little doubt that the therā traversed the length and breadth of Ceylon, preaching the Doctrine wherever he went.

Maliyadeva therā was skilful in suggesting to people the kind of meditation of exercise for meditation proper to each. The Vimuttiśāstrī mentions an occasion when he gave an exercise, which appeared very simple on the surface, to two bhikkhus who were well versed in two or three Nikāyas. At the end of the exercise, however, both of them attained the Sotāpatti state.³

The name of this therā is mentioned twice in the Jātakaṭṭhakathā as having been one of the last to leave the household life during certain previous existences of the Buddha.⁴ On the day of his passing away he is reported to have said that he was ^{the last} to enter parinibbāna from among the people in the Māgadhaka Jātaka.⁵ A belief prevails in Ceylon, chiefly among the half-educated Buddhists, that Maliyadeva was the last

1. Pap Sn 1024

2. ~~Sn 1024~~ Pap Sn 1025

3. Vi I 241

4. J IV 490; Vi 30.

5. Ibid. Vi 30

see

Arahant in Ceylon. As we shall ^{later} the Atthakathās mention the names of many others who attained Arahantship after his day. The utterance, mentioned above, is evidently the basis of this popular belief.

Dhamma
-gutta.

Dhammagutta shared Dupphagāmaṇi's gift of millet-gruel with the bhikkhus at Kalyāṇi vihāra. Both in the Mahāvamsa and in the Jātakapṛakāśa he is spoken of as one who could cause the earth to quake (pathavissālake).¹

Dhammagutta is also said to be one of those who left the world last in the above mentioned previous existences of the Buddha.

Khudda
-tissa.

Khuddatissa (small Tissa) of Maṅgala divided his portion of the gift with the bhikkhus in Kālāsavihāra. A Kujjatissa (humpbacked or deformed Tissa) of Maṅgala whose death occurred during the reign of Saddhātissa (Dupphagāmaṇi's brother) is mentioned in the Manorathapurāṇi.² From the proximity in both the meaning of the two names and the periods in which they lived, there is no doubt that both names referred to the same individual. He was an Arahant of great repute and loved the life of solitude in his old age. Lest he should be requested by king Saddhātissa to visit the palace, Kujjatissa once resorted to a curious trick to deceive the king. When he heard the king was coming to

1. Mv 32.53; J IV 490
2. Man II 247

him he sat down drawing figures on the ground. The king was disgusted at the seeming lack of self-composure and went back without even saluting him. The thera thus saved himself from the burden of visiting a noisy town and receiving respect and homage from the royal household !

Mahāvvyaggha.

Mahāvvyaggha, who was the fifth st of those who received the millet-gruel, shared it with the bhikkhus in the Ukkanagara-vihāra. This thera, too, died during the reign of Saddhātissa, shortly after the passing away of Sujjatissa thera.

If there is any historical truth behind the last utterance of Maliyadeva thera ¹, the other theras mentioned in the two passages of the Jātakatthakathā, ² namely, Mahāvapsaka, Phussadeva of Kāṭakandhakāra, Mahā-Saṅgharakkhiṭṭa ³ of Upari-maṇḍala, Mahādeva ⁴ of Bhaggiri, Mahāsiva of Vāṇanta- or Gāṇanta-pabbhāra and Mahanaga of Kālavallinappāḍapa must have been contemporaneous with or earlier than Maliyadeva.

Mahāvapsaka

It is not easy to say whether Mahāvapsaka was the name of a different thera or whether it was linked appositionally with some thera's name. The context makes it difficult to take it in the latter sense. Prof. Rhys Davids takes

1. J VI 30

2. J IV 490, VI 30

3. Mahārakkhiṭṭa J VI 30

4. Mahātissa of Bhaggiri J VI 30

it as a literary epithet used to distinguish Khuddatissa of Mahāgama from the many other Tissas. "This (i.e. Mahāvamsa) means " he says " 'the one mentioned in the Mahāvamsa'- that he is, the old Mahāvamsa, in Sinhalese prose with Pāli verses, on which our Pāli Dipavamsa and Mahāvamsa are based. A list of the thera-paruṇḍara taken from that Mahāvamsa is preserved at p.2 of the Parivāra, and one of the two Tissa Theras mentioned in it is doubtless the man referred to. In any case, he was identical with the Tissa Thera who is mentioned in the Pāli (p 197 of Turnour's edition) as having lived at Mahāgama, in the highest mountains of Ceylon, about 120 B.C." ¹ A good inference indeed ! But to me the identity is not so doubtless.

Phussadeva

Phussadeva of Katakandhakāra is mentioned again in the Samantapāsādikā .

There it is described how Māra tried but failed in his attempt to destroy the feeling of joy caused by arisen in Phussadeva as a result of contemplation on the Buddha (Buddhārambana-pīti) . This joy, it is further said, was obtained as a result of his cleaning and sweeping the compound of a cetiya and became the basis of insight for his attainment of Arhantship.² Prof. Rhys Davids identifies this thera with Mahaphussadeva of Alindaka mentioned in the Sumāngala-vilāsini ³ and also with Phussadeva ' the great preacher' whose

1.J.R.A.S. 1901 p 890

2.Snp Sn II 376

3.SumVil I 189

name occurs in the list of teachers at Parivāra p.2.¹ The name *Xiindakavāsi Mahāphussadeva* occurs in several other Commentaries also.² The way he attained Arahantship is quite different from that related of *Kajakandhakāravāsi Phussadeva* in the *Basantapāsādikā*.³ This identity is therefore clearly not correct. Nor is he the same as the Phussadeva of the Parivāra list. As it will be shown later the last mentioned there flourished in the first century A.D.

Mahāsaṅgha

-rakkhita.

The next is *Mahāsaṅgharakkhita* of *Uparimaṇḍala* in *Malaya*. His name occurs in the *Jātakatthakathā*⁴ as *Uparimaṇḍala - mālā-vāsi Mahārakkhita* and in the *Mano-rathapūraṇi*⁵ as *Malayavāsi Mahāsaṅgharakkhita*. He is described as one who was noted for his unattachment and freedom from anger.⁶ He had an excellent pupil in *Mahātissabbhūti* of *Maṇḍalārāma*,⁷ who was a prominent there at the time when *Vattagāmaṇi Abhaya* (29-17 B.C.) ascended the throne of Ceylon.⁸

Mahātissa

of Maṇḍalārāma

We have hardly any information

about Mahātissa *of Maṇḍalārāma*

Mahātissa The corresponding name

1. J.R.A.S. 1901 pp 890,891
2. More details of this there will be given later.
3. *Sup Sn* II 376
4. *J VI* 30
5. *Man I* 40
6. *Att* 268
7. *Man I* 39,40; *Pap I* 66
8. *SV* 448
- 9.

Mahātissa
of Bhaggari

We have hardly any information about Bhaggarivāsi Mahātissa.¹ The corresponding name at Jātaka IV 490 is Bhaggirivāsi Mahādeva. As Prof. Rhys Davids has pointed out it is possible that he is one of the Tissas - in my opinion, not the second but the first - mentioned in the Parivāra list.²

Mahāsiva
of Vānanta
-pabbhāra.

Mahāsiva of Vānantapabbhāra was also a thera who lived about this time. A Mahāsiva of Gāmantapabbhāra is mentioned in the Sumāṅgalavilāsinī and the Manorathapūraṇī.³ It is very likely that in ^{one} or the other of the words Vāmanāta and Gāmanāta there is a wrong reading and the ~~the~~ same hill (~~pabbhāra~~) is referred to by both the words. In this case, too, I am unable to agree with ~~in~~ Prof. Rhys Davids when he identifies this thera with the Mahāsiva of the Parivāra list.⁴ the Sumāṅgalavilāsinī⁵ and the Atthasālinī.⁶ The thera ~~like~~ mentioned in these three books and also in some other Commentaries lived in the first century A.D. How Mahāsiva of Gāmantapabbhāra tried for thirty years and succeeded in becoming an Arahant is described in detail in the Sumāṅgalavilāsinī⁷ and in the Manorathapūraṇī.⁸

1. J VI 30

2. J.R.A.S. 1901 p 892

3. SumVil III 727; Man 40, 42

4. Parivāra p 3

5. SumVil I 202, 203

6. Att 220. Also see J.R.A.S. 1901 p 892

7. SumVil III 727

8. Man I 40, 41

Mahānāga of
Kālavallī-
maṇḍapa.

The last in this group is Mahānāga of Kālavallīmaṇḍapa (the Pavilion of the Black Creeper). He became an Arahant after practising meditation for seven years using only the two postures of standing and walking, and again practising the observance called the matapaccāgatavatta for sixteen years.¹ It is said that one day he gave his own share of food to an Arahant bhikkhū and as a result of that never had any difficulty in obtaining his meals. The incident is said to have taken place in the village Nakulanagara near Uttasālagāma (in Rohana)².

In addition to the theras mentioned above, the names of the following also of the same period occur in the Mahāvamsa and in the Commentaries:

Theraputtābhaya - at first a warrior who took part in the war of Dutthagāmaṇi with the Tamils.³ When the war was over he joined the Order and became an Arahant.⁴ We see him for the last time sitting by the side of the king and offering him words of consolation as the latter lay in his death-bed.⁵

Sudhamma Sāmanera - a nephew of the famous Talaṅgara-vāsi Dhammaḍḍiṃṇa. He is reported to have possessed

1. ApA 121; SV 352; Pj II 56; EA Sn 133 III 155;
SumVil I 190

2. Att 399

3. MV 23.55-63 and 32.12

4. Ibid. 26.2-5

5. Ibid. 32.18 foll.

a marvellous memory and to have learned the whole of the three Pitakas by listening to the Doctrine as expounded by his uncle.¹

Mahātissa of Rohana - another there who was under the self-deception that he was an Arahant but was disillusioned by Talaṅgaravāsi Dhammaḍḍa.²

Mahātissa of Maṇḍalārāma - a reciter of the Dhammapaṭṭa.³

Mahāsiva of Bhāṭṭivāra,⁴

Tissa⁵ of Koṭṭipabbatavihāra (or Koṭṭapabbata)

Arula⁶ ,,

Mahāsumma⁷ ,,

Soṇuttara - who was entrusted with the duty of bringing relics for the Mahāsthūpa,⁸ and the

Sāmaṇeras Uttara and Sumana - who were requested to bring special stones to make the relic-chamber in the above mentioned cetiya.⁹

A few words should also be said about the state of the bhikkhuni-sāsana at this period.

According to the Dipavaṇṇa five well known bhikkhunīs Mahilā, Samantā, Girikālī, Dāsi, and Kālī came from Rohana with a retinue of twenty thousand bhikkhunīs and taught

1. EV 389

2. Man I 42

3. DhA IV 51

4. Mv 30.46

5. Puggala Paṭṭatti Commentary in J.P.T.S. 1914

6. DhA IV 50

(p 186; VI I 292

7. Mv 23.60

8. Ibid. 31.4

9. Ibid. 30.37

Bhikkhunis the Vinaya at Anurādhapura. Among these Mahilā and Samantā were daughters of King Kālavannatissa¹ and, therefore, sisters (or half-sisters) of Dutthagāmaṇi; Girikālī was the daughter of Kālavanna's purohita (chaplain), and the other two, though themselves self-restrained nuns, were daughters of a man of bad repute.¹ The Mahāvamsa tells us that ninety thousand bhikkhunis were gathered together at the festival of the consecration of the Mariyāvatti vihāra.² When the thera Piyadassi preached the Doctrine on the occasion of the beginning of the construction of the Mahāsetiya, the multitude who attained Arhantship included fourteen thousand bhikkhunis.³ Whatever these 'thousands' meant there is hardly any doubt that the bhikkhuni-sāsana was in a flourishing state at the period under our discussion.

Rendered majestic by the μ limitless beneficence of the most powerful monarch Ceylon ever saw and resplendent with the brilliance of these theras and theris, learned and of stainless purity of character, this period stands out unique in the history of Buddhism in Ceylon.

The king passed away after twenty four years of strenuous effort to place the religion and the country on a sound basis.

1. Dip 18.20-23
 2. Mv 26.15
 3. Ibid.19.69

Saddhātissa

(77-59 B.C.)

Durthagāmani was succeeded by his brother Saddhātissa (Tissa the Devoted). His was a reign of uninterrupted peace and prosperity.

He did not have the burden of fighting with enemies at home or abroad and putting his house in order. As we saw in the foregoing pages all that had been done by his brother; and the country being already in a state of prosperity, he could devote his entire time to religious pursuits.

His faith and devotion knew no bounds. Buddhaghosa describes how for one full night the king stood listening, with rapt attention, to a discourse delivered by Kāla-Buddhakarakhita there.¹ No less was the sincerity with which he observed the tenets of Buddhism. For three long years he suppressed a strong desire to eat snipe-flesh (*littira-mayasa*), fearing that many of these birds would be killed if he let his desire be known. At last a man, Tissa by name, was found who would not kill a living being even at the risk of his own life. The king then requested him to bring *littira* flesh that was kept for sale and not killed specially for him.² When the dish was at last ready he offered a portion of it to a sāmanera at Tatthakassāla Parivāsa and, it is said, that he was greatly pleased and delighted at the self-restrained behaviour of the sāmanera.³

1. Pap II 294

2. Man II 30; SA Sn III 49

3. Man II 30

Perhaps spoilt by the excessive generosity of Dutthagāmaṇī, the bhikkhus at Anurādhapura seem to have had grown lax in discipline, especially with regard to their personal requisites. Saddhātissa ceased giving alms to them and daily showered his gifts of requisites on the bhikkhus at Utiyapabbata. When questioned by the people as to the reason for concentrating his generosity on Utiyapabbata alone, he gave meals on the following day to the bhikkhus at Anurādhapura and justified his attitude by pointing out to the people the unsatisfactory manner in which the bhikkhus behaved in accepting the food.¹

Another incident which shows lack of self-control on the part of a young bhikkhu is recorded in the Manorathapūraṇī. Saddhātissa was one day going to the vihara in the company of the ladies of his royal household. A young bhikkhu, standing at the gate of the Lehapāsāda, looked at one of them and was instantly consumed with passion for her. Reciprocal feelings arose in the woman, too, and, we are told, both died as a result of that excessive lust.²

It would, however, be quite incorrect to suppose that the whole brotherhood of bhikkhus of Saddhātissa's day was guilty of such laxity in discipline. It is not possible to ~~suppose~~ think that the spiritual heights attained by many of them in the time of Dutthagāmaṇī could have been lost to

1. SV 473
2. Man I 23

the country in so short a time. We have evidence that great theras such as Sujjātissa and Mahāvyaḡga survived Dutthagāmaṇi,¹ and there probably were many others of the same group, though we have no records left of them.

One of the most illustrious theras who flourished during the reign of Saddhātissa was Kāla-Buddharakkhita. He was the son of a minister (perhaps of king Dutthagāmaṇi), and entering the Order in due course became proficient in the teachings of the Buddha. He became an Arhant while at Vāṭa-kasitapabbata and lived at the Cetiya-pabbata vihāra as the head of a vast number of bhikkhus.² Reference has already been made to a discourse delivered by this thera and listened to with rapt attention by the king.³

Saddhātissa reigned for eighteen years and during this period many vihāras such as those at Dakkhiṇagiri, Kallakālena, Kāṇṇaka Kalambaka, Paṭṭaṅgavālika, Velāṅgaviṭṭhika, Dubbalavāpitiṣṣa, Dūratissakavāpi and the Mātuvihāra were built by him. He is also said to have built vihāras from Amurādhapura to Dighavāpi, one for every yojana (of the way). During this reign the nine-storeyed Lohapāsāda caught fire from a lamp and Saddhātissa built it anew, seven storeys high.⁴

Saddhātissa suffered the disadvantages of coming immediately after - or rather we suffer in a true evaluation of his merits by contrasting him with - a much

1. Man II 247
 2. Pap II 293 foll.
 3. Ibid. 294
 4. Mv 33.6 foll.

greater ruler, Dutthagāmaṇi. Nevertheless, Tissa^{was}, a powerful monarch indeed, and contributed much to the welfare of the sāsaṇa.

The spread of Buddhism in Ceylon was complete in the reign of Tissa; perhaps it had already seen completion before the death of Gāmaṇi. One may, without much fear of contradiction, say that it is in the time of these two brothers that the island of Lanka witnessed the zenith of Buddhist glory.

Before concluding this chapter it may be useful to note how the centre of Buddhist activities moved from time to time during the two centuries that we have so far reviewed. Though Mahinda arrived at Cetiyapabbata and the conversion of Devānampiyatissa took place there, Amurādhapura soon became the stronghold of the faith and remained so for nearly three-quarters of a century up to the defeat of Śūratissa by the Tamil invaders (c.177 B.C.). The scene now changes. Anurādhapura is gradually abandoned by the saṅgha and Rohana becomes the new centre. Cetiyapabbata retains some of its strength, as it, being a mountain at some distance from the town, afforded no material attractions to the invaders. The defeat of Kāra by Dutthagāmaṇi (101 B.C.) changes the scene again and Amurādhapura once more becomes the headquarters of the sāsaṇa. Lastly during the reign of Saddhātissa - and this time not due to political disturbances - Amurādhapura loses its grandeur and is eclipsed by Cetiyapabbata.

CHAPTER IV

The Writing down of the Texts.

The prosperity that Ceylon enjoyed under the reigns of Dutthagamani and Saddhātissa was destined not to last long. After the death of the latter his second son Thūlathana was appointed king according to the decision of Saddhātissa's counsellors and of the monks in the Thūpārāma.¹ Evidently Thūlathana was more favourably disposed towards the bhikkhus, but this intervention in political matters brought with it ^{serious} consequences on the saṅgha. Only for one month and ten days had Thūlathana been king when Lafjātissa, the elder son of Saddhātissa, hurried to Anurādhapura, overpowered his brother and took over the reins of government.²

Lafjātissa, being the elder, was the lawful heir to the throne, and in their choice the bhikkhus were clearly wrong from a conventional point of view, however right they may have been in choosing the better man. Now that

1. Mv 33.vv 17, 18. It is interesting to note that the bhikkhus responsible for this selection were those in the Thūpārāma and not in the Mahāvihāra as one would have expected.

2. Ibid. 33.19

Lafjatissa was in power he avenged the injustice done to him ^{he} and for three years he kept either slighting or neglecting the bhikkhus. Later he changed his mind and was reconciled with them. Thereafter he built many viharas, and showered upon these monks gifts of food and raiment. The comfort of the bhikkhus, too, was well looked after.¹

Khallātanāga
50-43 B.C.

Vattagāmani
43 B.C.

Lafjatissa was succeeded by his younger brother Khallātanāga. After he had been king for six years, he was overpowered by a rebel of the name Kammahāratika, who, in turn, was almost immediately slain by Khallātanāga's younger brother Vattagāmani. The latter had ruled for scarcely five months when a young brāhmana, named Tissa, in Rohana raised a revolt. Simultaneously with this uprising ~~six~~ seven Tamils came with their troops from South India. The Mahāvamsa dismisses the rebellion of Brāhmanatissa without giving any details of its consequences on the country.² The Commentaries, however, have preserved for us many valuable episodes which give an insight not only into the political and social unrest created, but also to the repercussions it had caused in the sāsa, and into the reasons

The Brāhmana-
tissa Peril.

1. Mv 33.21-28
2. Ibid. 33.37-41

which led to that most momentous event in the history of Theravāda Buddhism, namely, the writing down of the Buddhist Canonical Texts.

Tissa was a very powerful brāhmana, so powerful that Vattagāmi, at least for the time being, dared not meet him in open battle.¹ The Samsohaviniḍāni tells us: "The rebel Brāhmapatissa plundered the district. The monks discussed in council and sent eight theras to Sakka requesting him to ward off the rebel. Sakka, the king of the devas, replied: 'Sirs, it is not possible to ward off the rebel that has risen. May you go abroad. I shall protect you (while) on the sea.'² Behind this curious story lies hidden the historical truth of the tremendous power wielded by Tissa. The hatred with which Tissa was looked upon is well illustrated by the epithet Candāla³ sometimes added to his name.⁴ What greater dishonour could there be to a brāhmana than to be called a candāla!

In addition to the ruin wrought by the rebel, nature too became an adversary of the country. For twelve years there was a severe famine which has no parallel in the history of the island.⁵ The monasteries in Anurādhapura were abandoned and the bhikkhus made their way either to India or to the hilly districts of Ceylon. It would not be out of place to give here

1. Mv 33.37 foll.

2. Sv 445,446

3. A man of one of the lowest castes.

4. Man I 92

5. SA II 111.

a brief summary of the episodes treasured for us in the Commentaries.

According to the Samachavāṇodanī, bhikkhus from all quarters assembled at Jambukela-pattana in Māgadīpa¹ to cross over to India. The three theras Saṅguttakāṇḍaka, Cūlasiva, Isidatta and Mahāsena were at the head of the monks assembled there. Knowing the competency of Mahāsena to protest the sasana at a future date, the other two theras advised him to go abroad and return after the peril was over. As Cūlasiva and Isidatta had decided not to cross over, Mahāsena too stayed behind. Cūlasiva requested Isidatta to protect Mahāsena with very great care, and himself went to pay his veneration to the Mahācetiya. At that time the Mahāvihāra was empty, casket plants had grown on the courtyard of the Mahācetiya. All around it were bushes and the cetiya itself was covered with moss. Thence he went to a place near the Jaggara river where the people were living on leaves. The thera lived there till better times came.² The name of this thera occurs again in the Viṁśadhinaṅga where he is mentioned as an example of one on whom poison had no effect because he practised universal love.³

Isidatta and Mahāsena, too, had a very trying time. While travelling about the country they came to the

1. The north-western part of Ceylon. See
My Translation p.6 note 2.

2. SV 446.447

3. V1 I 313

district of Ala (Alajanapada).¹ In one place there the people had ~~take~~ taken the kernels from some ~~radhu~~ fruits and left behind on the ground the outer coverings, which the theras picked up and ate. That was the only food they had for a whole week. On another occasion they lived on the stalks of the water lily and later on the bark of the banana.²

The account of Vattabbaka Nigrodha and of his aged preceptor is still more pathetic. They travelled from place to place living on most scanty food. The famine had, by that time, grown so acute that people ate even human flesh. The aged thera fell a prey to some such people maddened by hunger. Nigrodha, however, made good his escape and, after the famine was over, learned the three Pitakas and became a well-known thera.³

Numberless people, both from the monkhood and from the laity, died of starvation. The Sammohavinodani tells us that both at Tissamahārāma and at Cittalapabbatavihāra there was at that time sufficient grain for three years and all

-
1. The Samantapāsādikā mentions that the Alanda-nagarājanahesi renewed the gift of an aqueduct which was abandoned by the monks of Cittalapabbata, a well known monastery in Rohana (Sup III 680). The word Alanda-nagarājanahesi, in my opinion, means like 'the consort of the Nāga king, the chief of Ala (Ala+inda-Alanda). If this interpretation is correct, Alajanapada was a district in Rohana, and its population consisted predominantly of people of the Nāga (race.
 2. EV 447, 448
 3. Ibid, 449, 450

of it was eaten by rats. Twelve thousand Arhantās from each of these viharas set out to the other vihāra, but they met midway and hearing the same news from each other, entered a forest and passed away, knowing that it was useless to return to their monasteries.¹ Whatever significance there may be in these numbers and in the description of the almost miraculous incidents connected with the episode, there is no doubt that a very large number of bhikkhus died for want of food.

An instance is recorded in the Manorathapūraṇī² of a therī, Nāga by name, who was left behind with some other young bhikkhunīs in the village Bhataragāma, when the inhabitants abandoned it in search of a less miserable place. The inhabitants did not inform the therī of their departure because they were no longer able to support her and her fellow bhikkhunīs, and also perhaps because they did not have the heart to express their inability to support her at such a disastrous time as that.

Other theras who are mentioned as having lived about this time are Tissabhūti of Maṇḍalārāma, Sumanadeva of Gāma, Phussaadeva and Upatissa.

Tissabhūti lived at Maṇḍalārāma in Kālakagāma. An interesting account of how he destroyed his impure thoughts is given

1. SV 445

2. Man Sn 670, 671

in the Manorathapūraṇī. One day, when he was yet a student, he was going through a village on his begging round. There he saw a certain woman and immediately impure thoughts entered his mind. He returned to the vihāra, informed his teacher Malayavāsī Mahāsaṅgharakkhita there of the incident and obtained a suitable meditation from him. He was determined to destroy his impure thoughts or, failing it, to put an end to his own life. With this determination in his mind he made obeisance again and again to his teacher before he took leave of him. The teacher inquired why he did so, and Tissabhūti replied: "Good it is if I shall be successful in my attempt. If, however, I fail, this shall be my last salutation to you." Tissabhūti retired to a solitary spot, and, engaged in strenuous meditation, extirpated all lustful thoughts and became an Arahant.¹ A short time after the Brāhmapatiśsa famine was over, the people in Kālakagāma arranged an almsgiving on a magnificent scale. The Sammahavāsinodanī tells us that, on that occasion, Tissabhūti there was given the principal seat.²

The Atthasālinī has another reference to this therā. One day he was explaining that the place of the Great

1. Man I 39,40. The Papatheasudani (I 66) gives a slightly different version, according to which, Tissabhūti controlled his thoughts as soon as the impurity entered his mind; but at night, during sleep, he saw the same object in dream a dream. Then he received advice from his teacher and put an end to his sense desires.

2. SV 448

Enlightenment was the nidāna (the place of origin) of the Abhidhamma Pitaka. The thera Sumassadeva of Gama , while preaching the Doctrine at the base of the Brazen Palace, heard this and called him a heretic (paravādi) who did not know the nidāna of the Abhidhamma. He then proceeded to give the true version of how the Buddha preached the Abhidhamma at the foot of the Pāricchattaka tree in Tāvātimsa, a world of the devas! ¹

Phussadeva and Upatissa, pupils of the same teacher, were proficient in the Vinaya. During the Brāhmanatissa famine they protected the Vinaya Pitaka. ² More about these theras will be said in the next chapter.

It should be remembered that at this time the teachings of the Buddha were, as mentioned before, handed down orally from teacher to pupil. Thus there remained always at this time the danger of some parts of the teachings being lost as the result of the death of those who had memorized them and of the inability of many, weakened by starvation, to proceed with their studies. Nor was there any guarantee of the ~~the~~ returning of those bhikkhus who went abroad as none could guess when the famine would end. Seeing this grave danger, those who knew the books by heart took all precautions not to allow the Texts to fall into oblivion. Sixty bhikkhus who had even gone so far as the coast to cross over to India ^T returned to the southern Malaya district and lived there eating only roots and leaves.

1. Att 30, 31. Also see The Expositor I 38, 39.

2. Snp I 263

They never failed to recite the Texts lest they should forget them. When they had sufficient strength to sit down they recited the Texts, keeping themselves in that posture, and, when they could no longer keep their bodies erect, they laid their heads on mounds of sand and continued their recitations. In this wise they preserved in full for twelve years the Texts as well as the Commentaries.¹ One book, however, was on the verge of being lost to the world. And that was the Mahānidāsa of the Sutta Pitaka. Only one bhikkhu could recite it. Mahātipitaka there, the preceptor of Cātunīkāyāsiṃha Tissa,² requested ~~with great persuasion~~ a bhikkhu named Mahārakkhita, who had great powers of memory, to learn the Mahānidāsa; but the latter refused to do so on the ground that the person who knew it was known to be a man of impure life. Mahārakkhita was at last persuaded and, learning it day and night, he completed the task. The person from whom Mahārakkhita learned the Text was afterwards proved to be a very immoral bhikkhu, yet the book was thus saved from being lost for ever. Many other theras, in turn, learned the Text from Mahārakkhita.³

1.Man I 92

2.An account of Cātunīkāyāsiṃha Tissa of Kolita vihāra and of his brother Dattābhaya of Potaliya vihāra is given in the Manorathapūraṇī(II 173). Perhaps these two Cātunīkāyāsiṃha Tissas were identical.

3.Snp III 695.

After twelve long years of endless suffering and misery the famine came to an end. The rebel Brāhmanatissa died and Vattagāmaṇi ascended the throne again.¹ Such is the account

Vattagāmaṇi

29-17 B.C.

given in the Commentaries.
They are silent on the invasion of the

seven Tamils recorded in the Mahāvamsa.

According to this Chronicle the rebel Tissa was slain by the Tamil invaders. One of these returned to South India taking with him Saṃādevī, one of the queens of Vattagāmaṇi. Another took the Buddha's alms-bowl and returned home straightway well contented. When Vattagāmaṇi fled the other five reigned successively, each of the last four slaying his predecessor and taking possession of the throne for himself. The last was overthrown by Vattagāmaṇi, who then brought the whole country under his sway.²

Things took a better turn with the coming into power of Vattagāmaṇi Abhaya.³ Hearing that the peril was over and that the country was prosperous, the bhikkhus who ~~went~~ had gone to India returned. Now they, on ~~their~~ their return, sought out Mahāsena there and Vattabbaka Nigrodha, mentioned before, is described in the Sammohavinodanī.⁴ The sixty bhikkhus who had retreated to the southern Malaya district and had sought to preserve the Texts by reciting them ~~even~~, if necessary, even at the cost of their own lives, heard of the return of

1. SV 448

2. Mv 33 54-61

3. He is also called Piturājā (Father King) as he placed himself in the position of father to his brother's son, prince Mahācūḷika

4. SV 448, 451

(Mv 33.36

the bhikkhus from India and went in search of them to compare the Texts as the former remembered them. It is said that the versions of the two parties agreed word for word.¹

The Dipavamsa tells us that after the (*Brahmapa-tissa*) peril had disappeared (*anagato bhayo*), the bhikkhus Mahāsena, Dattā, Sivalā, Nāgā, Nāganittā, Dharmagutta, Sasiyā, Samuddā, Sapattā, Channa, Upālī, Revatā, Mallā, Khesā, and Tissā were the first to teach the Vinaya in Ceylon. Then at the request of king (*Vattagāmapī*) Abhaya came Sivalā and Mahāruci with a large number of bhikkhus from India. These, too, taught the Vinaya Pitaka at Amuradhapura. From them the following bhikkhus received the *upasampadā* ordination : Samuddanīvā, Devī and Sivalā (who were daughters of the king), Nāganittā, Mahilā and (a second) Nāganittā.²

It is evident from the description given above of the conditions of the country at the time that, in spite of the existence of a number of faithful bhikkhus whose self-sacrificing efforts saved the Pāli Texts from being for ever lost, the state of Buddhism had fallen from the heights it occupied in the time of Dutthagāmapī and Saddhatissa. The causes that led to such a state of affairs are not all clear to us from the evidence available. One of the chief reasons, no doubt, was the decadence of the power of the

1. Man I 92

2. Dip 18. 27-35

Sinhalese kings who were always the greatest benefactors of the sāsana. Another reason was very likely the entering into the Order of monks of people, who, however intelligent and learned they might have been, were seekers after comfort and worldly pleasure. Such a man, indeed, was the thera who know alone knew the Mahāniddesa. The faith of the people was so great that as long as there were any provisions available in the country the sustenance of a bhikkhu remained assured. This, needless to say, must have had drawn many undesirables into the sāsana Order.

This period witnessed a change in the attitude of the monks towards 'living the life'. Perhaps because it was easier to be a learned man than to be a saint, or perhaps the difficulty, and therefore all the more the necessity, of preserving the Texts was becoming more and more evident, the bhikkhus tended to think that parivatti (learning) was of greater importance than parivatti parivatti (living the life). The Maṅgerathapūraṇī tells us that a discussion arose from abroad among the bhikkhus who returned after the famine "whether parivatti was the root of the sāsana or whether it was parivatti (parivatti pa the sāsana mūla uṭṭhu parivatti)? After arguments had been adduced on both sides the dhammakathūkas¹ gained victory over the paṇḍulikas². Practice was relegated

1. Preachers of the Doctrine.

2. Observers of the ascetic practice called paṇḍulika. The term is however used in a wider sense and denotes observers of the Vinaya in general.

to the background and preaching gained supremacy. The Sutta defeated the Vinaya.¹ How different this was from the older attitude! "Vinayo nāma Buddhasāsanaṃ A Āyu" (Vinaya is the very life of the religion of the Buddha) cried out in bold terms the theses of old.² This change in attitude, though no attention has been paid to it in the Commentaries, is of the utmost importance in the history of Theravada Buddhism. This school of Buddhism claims its descent from Upāli,³ the greatest Vinayadhara among the disciples of the Buddha.⁴ Mahinda, too, the founder of this school in Ceylon, insisted on the reciting of the Vinaya by a Ceylonese bhikkhu as it was only then, he maintained, that the sāsaṇa would take root in Ceylon.⁵ Mahinda's Buddhism was a religion predominantly of practice, and the victory, mentioned above, of Suttanata over Vinaya, would not have been one after the heart of that great missionary. For this reason - and for other reasons, too, to be mentioned presently - the period of Vattagāmaṇi Abhaya opens a new era in the history of Buddhism in Ceylon.

Abhayagiri
va vihāra

During the fourteen years of his flight and life in disguise through fear of the Tamils, Vattagāmaṇi Abhaya was helped considerably by the two theeras

-
1. Man I 92,93
 2. Snp I 13
 3. Ibid I 62
 4. A I 25
 5. Snp I 102

Mahātissa of Kapikkalavihāra and Tissa of Hambugallakavihāra.¹ When Vattagāmaṇi defeated the Tamils and regained the throne, he abolished the monastery of Giri, a Jain ~~samāhi~~, ~~sam~~ ascetic, and built on its place the Abhayagirivihāra. As a token of his gratitude the king gave this vihāra to the ~~thera~~ Mahātissa.² This vihāra, which was to play a large part in the subsequent history of Buddhism in the island, was built, as may be inferred from the Mahāvamsa, in the year 29 B.C.³ Several other vihāras, too, built by the ministers of Vattagāmaṇi were given to the ~~thera~~ Tissa.⁴

The first
schism.

Shortly afterwards occurred another event which brought with it results of a very serious nature. Mahātissa, upon whom the king bestowed the Abhayagiri vihāra, was expelled by the brotherhood of the Mahāvihāra on the ground that the former had frequented the families of laymen. His ~~disciple~~ pupil, the ~~thera~~ known as Bahalamassu Tissa, went in anger to ~~the~~ the Abhayagirivihāra and abode there forming a separate faction. Thenceforward these bhikkhus came no more to the Mahāvihāra.⁵ This was the first schism that occurred in the saṅgha of Ceylon. Though the Abhayagiri now became

1. Mv 33.vv 49,71,75

2. Ibid. 33.80-83. More about this vihāra will be given later.

3. Ibid. 33.80

4. Ibid. 33.91

5. Ibid. 33.95 foll.

separated from the Mahāvihāra, it did not become a centre of heretical teachings till sometime later.¹ The expulsion of Mahātissa there must have had caused great displeasure in the heart of Vajjagāmi . The Mahāvamsa does not mention any favour bestowed by the king on the Mahāvihāra, whereas it makes clear the attention paid by him to the Abhayagiri.²

The writing
of the Texts

At this time the Bhikkhus of the Mahāvihāra thought it expedient to commit to writing the teachings of the Buddha which were preserved till then by word of mouth. The Mahāvamsa has only a brief reference to it.³ It gives neither the name of the place where it was done nor that of the person whose patronage rendered it possible for the work to be completed. But from other sources we learn that 500 monks assembled at Alu-vihāra (Aloka- vihāra) and receiving the help of a certain chieftain performed this memorable task.⁴ It should also be incidentally remarked that writing was known and practised in Ceylon long before this event took place, though the Buddhist Texts were handed down by oral tradition. This subject is fully discussed by Malalasekara in his "Pāli Literature of Ceylon." ⁵

The causes that led to this writing down of the Texts may be summarized as follows :

1. The island was in constant danger of being attacked by

1. See Chapter on "Growth of Dissident Schools".

2. MV 33.99

3. Ibid. 33. 100-101

4. Nikāyasāṅgraha pp 10-11. Also see P.L.O. 43

5. P.L.O. 44-47

by non-Buddhist foreigners and whenever they were successful, that period proved to be a very dark one for Buddhism. Wars and other forms of political unrest necessitated the abandoning of the chief centres of learning such as the Mahavihāra. This, it is easy to imagine, often resulted in the separation of the pupils from the teachers - the living books.

2. The Brāhmanatanna famine, too, made the bhikkhus think of the dangers of leaving the Texts to oral tradition. We have already seen with what great difficulty the Texts were preserved during that troublous period.

3. As time went on, irresponsible and irreligious people entered the Order, and, no doubt, the enthusiasm to hand down the Texts in their purity waned. The Mahāvamsa gives this as the direct cause.¹

4. The last, but not the least, was the formation of a school at Abhayagiri, separate from the Mahavihāra, and the king's partiality to this new school in preference to the Mahavihāra fraternity. This is made evident by the fact that the bhikkhus decided to write the Texts at the Aloka-vihāra, a place in the vicinity of Matala in the Central Province and remote from Anurādhapura, the capital of Vattagāmaṇi Abhaya. Moreover the fact that the person who helped in the work was a chieftain instead of the king as one would

1. Mv 33.101

have expected it to be, probably points to our former inference, namely, that the king was not favourably disposed towards the bhikkhus in the Mahāvihāra.

Whatever may have been the cause or causes that incited the bhikkhus to this task, the event decided the ^{not only} future of the Theravāda School of Buddhism but also of the whole field of Pāli Literature.

There is prevalent in Ceylon a tradition that the three Pitakas were recorded on sheets of gold and were deposited in a rock at the Aloka-vihāra. Perhaps this tradition is not without foundation and could the records be discovered on excavation, their value would indeed be unspeakable.

CHAPTER V

The First Literary Period.

Vatthagāmaṇi was succeeded by his nephew Mahācūḷi Mahātissa, who was noted for his piety and for his devotion to the ²thera Mahāsūzanna¹. Besides his pious activities mentioned in the Mahāvamsa, he is also recorded in the Karamba-hinna Caveinscript-
 Mahācūḷi
 Mahātissa
 17-38.C.
 ion to have been the donor of a cave at Ritigala to the Buddhist monkhood.² The Bhikkhunī-sāsana, too, seems to have been in a flourishing condition at this time.³

Towards the latter part of his reign the peace of the country was disturbed by his cousin Goranāga (Māga, the rebel). The disturbance created by him was fraught with evil for the saṅgha, for Goranāga, when he became king after the death of Mahācūḷi, continued to harass the bhikkhus from whom he received no refuge during his rebellion.⁴ For a quarter of a century, and especially under Amulā, Goranāga's infamous consort, Ceylon witnessed another spell of gloom in the sphere of her public life.

Rupakampan

Sikha

16-38 A.D.

1.Mv 34. 2,3.

2.Mv.2ay. 1 146

3.Mv 34.6,7

4.Ibid.,.Mv 34.13

Kutakappa
Tissa
16-38 A.D.

This gloom was dispelled by the rising into power of Kutakappa Tissa, the second son of Mahācūḷi Mahātissa. The Mahāvamsa does not give much information about the state of Buddhism during the half-century from the time of Mahācūḷi to that ^{of} Kutakappa, but the Pāli Commentaries have preserved for us a wealth of detail of inestimable value. During the whole of the early history of Buddhism in Ceylon we have, perhaps, only one other period about which we have more information than of this; and that period is the reign of Dutthagāmanī. The information available in the Commentaries is not to be had in any connected form, but, with careful ^{given} ~~comprisen and~~ and linking up of the references and episodes ~~marked~~ here and there, it is possible to make a fair reconstruction of the state of the religion at that time. The names of more than twenty theras can be assigned to this period, most of whom can be identified with those mentioned in the Parivāra and the Samantapāsādikā lists of teachers.¹ We shall make here a brief survey of the commentarial literature on these theras.

Upatissa
and
Phussadeva

Perhaps the two earliest theras belonging to the group under discussion are Upatissa and Phussadeva. The Parivāra list adds the epithet Medhavi (the wise) to Upatissa and Mahāsatthi (the great preacher) to Phussadeva.²

1. Par. pp 2,3. Snp I 62,63.

2. Par. p 3

Both of them were Vinayadharmas and were pupils of the same teacher (sambhāsarivāsa). During the Great Peril (i.e. the Brāhmanatissa famine) they protected the Vinaya Pīṭaka. Upatissa was the cleverer of the two, and he had two well known pupils, Mahāpaduma and Mahāsumma.¹ The latter studied the Vinaya Pīṭaka nine times. Mahāpaduma studied it nine times with him and another nine times alone. He was thus better versed in the Vinaya than his fellow pupil. Mahāsumma, after thus studying the Vinaya Pīṭaka nine times, left his teacher and went to reside on the other side of the river Mahawālīganga. Mahāpaduma expressed his disapproval of this departure, saying that as long as one's teacher was living, one should stay with him studying many times the Vinaya Pīṭaka as well ^{as} the Commentaries.² Differences of opinion between the two theras Upatissa and Phussaḍḍeva³ and also among the four⁴ - these two and Upatissa's pupils Mahāsumma and Mahāpaduma - as to the interpretation of certain Vinaya rules are mentioned in the Saṃvattapācādikā. An interpretation given by Phussaḍḍeva was rejected by his pupils on the ground that their teacher was not learned in the Abhi-dhamma, and, therefore, had no knowledge of the planes of existence (ācariyo na Abhidhammiko, bhikkhūntarāṃ na jñāti)⁵

There is hardly any doubt that the thera

1. Called also Mahāsumma.

2. Snp I 263, 264

3. See Snp II 456, III 653, 685

4. See Snp III 651, 714, 715

5. Snp II 495

Mahāpaduma
&
Mahāsūma

Mahāpaduma (the Great Lotus) was identical with the Pupphanāma (the Flower-named) ⁰ of the Parivāra list.¹ In the Samantapāsādikā we find Buddhaghosa paying great respect to the views of th^{is} theras as well as to those of Mahāsūma. There are instances where Mahāpaduma's expositions are considered to be as authoritative as those given in the Mahāpaccari, Kurundi and Mahā-Aṭṭakathā.² In the Commentaries we often find quoted as authority/ies Acariyavādas, views of teachers, and we have reason to suppose that Mahāpaduma was included among those teachers.³

Though Mahāsūma did not have the same proficiency in the Vinaya as Mahāpaduma, his views were considered by Buddhaghosa as authoritative as th^ose of the latter. Different views and interpretations of the Vinaya as put forward by these two theras occur very frequently in the Samantapāsādikā.⁴ According to the Mahāvamsa, Mahāsūma was highly respected by king Mahācūli Mahātissa.⁵

1. The Snp. list (I 63) has Phussanāma, but the alternate reading Pupphanāma given in the footnote appears to be the correct one.

2. Snp I 283, III 644

3. Ibid I 283

4. See e.g. Snp II 368

" " 387

" " 477

" III 535

" " 538

" " 556

Snp III 596

" " 609

" " 683

" " 719

Snp Sn II 54

" " 59

" " 282

" " 287

" " 289

" " 315

5. Mv 34.3

Amuruddha

A thera named Amuruddha is mentioned as the preceptor of Mahāsūma.¹

Mahātissa
of
Punnavallika.

The thera Mahātissa of Punnavallika is described as a reciter of the two Vibhaṅgas (Ukkatovibhaṅga-bhaṅga),. According to the Samantapāsādikā we feel inclined to think that he was a contemporary of Mahāpaduma there.² The Atthasālinī and the Visuddhimagga state that as a result of the thrill of joy (ubhega-pīti) obtained by contemplation on the Buddha, he was able to transport himself through the air to the Mahāestīya.³ The reference made by Buddhaghosa to a view held by this thera leads us to infer that he was probably a dweller in the forest (araṇṇavāsī or vanavāsī).⁴ If this inference is correct he was very likely identical with the Vanavāsī Mahātissa who attained Arahantship after practising the catamaccatavatti for nineteen years, and was also a contemporary of Mahāphussadeva there of Alindaka.⁵

Godha and
Karavika Tissa

The theras Godha⁶ and Karavika⁷ Tissa also appear to be contemporaneous with Mahāpaduma and Mahāsūma. We do not have much information about either of these

1. Snp III 698

2. Ibid. 644

3. Att 116, VI I 143

4. Snp III 644

5. Sv 352, Pi II 36, Pap I 258, SA Sn III 154

6. Snp III 588

7. Ibid. 646, 647

theras. A view of Karavīra Tissa on a point in the Vinaya is recorded in the Samantapaṇḍikā,¹ and he is called the Vinaya-dharanānukūḍha (the foremost among the Vinayadharas).² He may probably be identical with the second Tissa of the Parivāra list who is described with the epithets Madhavi (wise) and Vinaya vīṇarado (proficient in the Vinaya).³ He was also a contemporary of Mahāsiva therea.⁴

Mahāsiva

According to the information in available, the Pāli Commentaries it appears that there were two Mahāsiva theras, one versed in the three Piṭakas and the other devoted to the Vinaya. The mention of two such Sivas in the Parivāra list⁵ too, lends support to this same view. There is not much information about the one devoted to the Vinaya. The references in the Samantapaṇḍikā are very likely to this therea.⁶ The Tipiṭaka Mahāsiva therea (sometimes called also Mahāsivatthera - without the epithet Tipiṭaka) is held in high esteem by Buddhaghosa and is quoted many times in the Commentaries.⁶ He is also sometimes

1. Snp Sn II 208

2. Ibid. 237

3. Par. p 3

4. Snp Sn II 237

5. Par. p 3

6. Snp III 711

Snp Sn II 237

7. Sum Vil I 202, 203

.. II 373

.. 430, 511, 554, 555

.. III 892

x. Sum Vil I 202, 203

.. xii 373, 430, 511,

called Dīghabhāṣaka Mahāsiṃha¹ or Tipitaka Dīghabhāṣaka Mahāsiṃha.² On one occasion, however, Buddhaghosa prefers the Aṭṭhakathā view to that of Mahāsiṃha.³

Among the contemporaries of Mahāsiṃha may be mentioned the theras Oḷlasiva of Lokuttara,⁴ Gonaraviya⁵, and Summa of Kalhāla.⁶ In the Visuddhimagga mention is made of a Oḷlasiva who went over to India to lead a quiet life there as people in Ceylon troubled him too much by showing him their respect and offering him the requisites.⁷ We are, however, unable to identify him with the Oḷlasiva of Lokuttara. Gonaraviya is mentioned in connection with a discussion between himself and Mahāsiṃha.⁸ No detailed information is available of Summa.

Another therā belonging to this period is Tipitaka Oulanāga⁹ who may be identified with the Oulanāga of the Parivāra list. He was a pupil of Dīpavihāravāsi Summa,¹⁰ and is described as a man who would not give a reply

-
1. Sum VII III 805, 881; SA Sn III 171
 2. Sum VII II 543, III 883
 3. Sum VII II 554, 555; SA Sn III 198; Att 266, 267
 4. Sum VII III 883
 5. Pap II 286
 6. Sum VII III 882
 7. Vi I 170
 8. Pap II 286
 9. Att 266
 10. Man II 133

without first carefully thinking of it.¹ Cūlanāga was intensely loved by king Rurakamma Tissa. When the ~~thera~~ there was suffering from a serious illness and was lying on his death-bed, the king himself nursed him and went about weeping ~~that~~ ^{the} bemoaning the fact that 'the axle of the wheel of the Dhamma was about to break'.² Cūlanāga there was a learned man and a clever preacher. Once he preached the Chachakka Sutta with very great success at Ambilahālavihāra.³ A curious effect which a sermon of this ~~thera~~ on the doctrine of anattā (non-soul) had on a certain brāhmana is described in the Sāratthappakāsinī.⁴ Difference of views with regard to doctrinal topics between Cūlanāga and his teacher⁵ and also between himself and his fellow pupil Cūlābhaya⁶ is recorded in several places. Once a discussion arose among Tipitaka Cūlanāga, Tipitaka Cūlābhaya and Tipitaka Mahādharmarakkhita over a word in the Puggalapāṭiatti. The three ~~theras~~ expressed three different views, but they were preserved as authoritative statements on the ground that there must be some reason in all the three views as the ~~theras~~ were all learned men.⁷ There is, however,⁴ one instance where Buddhaghosa accepts an interpretation of Tipitaka Mahādharmarakkhita but hesitates to

1. Puggala Pāṭiatti Commentary, J.P.T.S 1914 p 223

2. SV 452

3. Pap Sn 1025

4. SA II 276

5. Pap I 230; Man II 133; Man Sn 831; SV 342
Sam VII III 744

6. SV 16; SA SN Sn III 206; Att 230

7. Pug.Pāṭi.Cem. J.P.T. 9. 1914 p 190

accept those of Cūlanāga and of Mahādatta of Moravāpi as they appeared to contradict the Canonical Text.¹

Tipitaka

Cūlabbhaya

Tipitaka Cūlabbhaya mentioned above was also a pupil of Dīpavihāravāsī Suman², and may safely be identified with the Cūlabbhaya of the Parivāra list.³ A

curious episode about his student days is given in the Visuddhimagga. It would not be out of place here to deal with the episode in brief as it gives an idea of the importance with which learning under a teacher and not merely from books was regarded at that time. The story runs as follows:

Tipitaka Cūlabbhaya there had learned all the three Piṭakas but had made no study of the Commentaries. One day he proclaimed by beat of the golden drum that he would preach from the Piṭakas at the Pañcanikāya- Maṇḍapa Pavilion. The bhikkhus decided that they would not allow him to preach anything which he had not learned from his teacher. When Cūlabbhaya went to see his preceptor, the latter asked him certain questions on the ācariyavāda and as he was unable to give answers with any certainty, he was asked to go and learn them from Mahādhamma-rakkhita there of Tuladhārapabbata-vihāra in Rohana. He went there accordingly and learned the teachings in their entirety.⁴

1. PsnA 405. For further references to Cūlanāga (and other persons also) see Appendix I a

2. Pap I 155

3. Par. p 3

4. Vi I 96

After studying at Rohana he returned to Amuradipura. We find him more than once engaged in teaching at the Lohapāsāda.¹ As a judge in hearing cases among the bhikkhus he was known impartial to the utmost.² He was well known, too, for the power of his memory,³ and he possessed the talent of answering questions promptly and to the point.⁴ Divergent views expressed by this *thera* and Cūlanāga have already been noted.⁵

Dipavihāra-
vāsī Summa.

As was remarked above, Summa of Dipavihāra⁶ was the teacher of both Tipitaka Cūlanāga and Tipitaka Cūlabhaya. The *thera* lived (at least for some time) at Girivihāra.⁷ An explanation given by him of a doctrinal topic is recorded as authority in the *Samangalavilāsinī*.⁸ King Dutakamma Tissa had very great affection and respect for this *thera*. The *Samacharavinodanī* gives an interesting account of a meeting of these two personages.⁹

Tipitaka
Mahādharmma-
rakkhita.

Tipitaka Mahādharmmarakkhita is already known to us as the learned *thera* of Rohana who taught the *accaravāgga* to

1. Snp III 591; Sum VII II 442

2. Snp III 591

3. Sum VII II 530

4. Pug. Pañ. Cos. J. P. I. S. 1914 p 223

5. Also see Man I 26, SA Sn III 215. For some of his other interpretations of the Doctrine, see SV II: VI I 69, II 394

6. Also called Summa of Dipavihāra (Pap I 155), Summa of Dibbavihāra (SV 342), and Tipitaka Cūla Summa (Pap I 230).

7. Sum VII II 514; Also called Giriganakamma

8. Sum VII II 514

(SV 452)

9. SV 452

Tipitaka Cūḍabhaya. According to the account in the Visuddhi-magga he knew all the Pitakas together with the Ācariya-vādas though he had been out of touch with them, excepting the Dīgha- and Majjhima- Nikāyas, for thirty years.¹ Buddhaghosa attaches very great importance to the views of this therā. In the Atthasālinī he includes an explanation of Dhammarakkhita among the Ācariya-vādas.²

Mahādatta
&
Dīghabhāṇaka
Abhaya.

Among the contemporaries of Mahā-dhammarakkhita may be classed Mahādatta of Moravāpi and Dīghabhāṇaka Abhaya.³ We do not have much information, besides what has been observed previously, concerning the former. An occasion on which Mahādatta's pupils pointed out an error in one of his explanations is recorded in the Atthasālinī.⁴ From the same Commentary it is evident that his views, too, were preserved as Ācariya-vādas.⁵

On the other hand there are many passages referring to Abhaya. He may be identified with the therā of the same name in the Parivāra list. In some places the name occurs also as Dīghabhāṇaka Mahā Abhaya.⁶ Though it is very likely that this name and as the name Dīghabhāṇaka Abhaya both referred

-
1. VI I 96
 2. Att 230 278
 3. EV 81
 4. Att 230
 5. Att 284-286
 6. Man II 249

to the same person we are unable to come to any definite conclusion about it.

Buddhaghosa quotes the name of Abhaya as a *thera* noted for his memory¹ and again as one famed for his patience with abuse.² In the *Atthasalini* there is an interesting account of how *Dighabbhāpaka Abhaya* showed hospitality to a band of thieves who came to plunder *Cetiya-pabbata-vihara*.³ Not only was Abhaya a pious and saintly monk, there is evidence to show that he was also a very clever preacher. According to the *Manoratha-purani* a woman of the village *Ullabbhakolakammikā*, hearing that *Dighabbhāpaka Abhaya* was to preach the *Arāḍiyavaṃsapatipadā*, walked a distance of five *yojanas* with her suckling baby in her arms.⁴ The *Papañcasūdanī* has preserved an account of how Abhaya convinced a *thera* living at *Kalyāṇī* that the latter had not till then attained *Arahantship*.⁵ The *Visuddhimagga* and the *Samaññavāsinī* make mention of two conversations which Abhaya had with a *thera* named *Mallaka*⁶ and with *Mahādhamma-rakkhita*⁷ respectively. The latter discussion was on the significance of a word in the *Vibhaṅga*. This fact shows that

or

1. *Sms* VII II 530. Here we find another Abhaya, namely, *Mahāgatisa Abhaya*, who was noted for the same faculty. This makes it difficult to determine which of the two *theras* is meant when the name occurs simply as Abhaya. See e.g. *SV* 275; *Man* II 54; *Pap* I 290; *Smp* Sn II 377.
2. *Pap* I 79
3. *Att* 399; *Smp* II 474
4. *Man* II 249
5. *Pap* Sn 869
6. *VI* I 266
7. *SV* 81

Dighabbhāṣaka Abhaya knew not only the Dighanikāya but the Abhidhamma as well.

As was pointed out in the preceding pages, most of these ^{theras} can be identified with those mentioned in the Parivāra and in the Samantapāsādikā. The earliest among these belonging to the period in question are Upatissa and Puṣṣadeva.¹ Siva there, the last one in the list, is very likely, as observed elsewhere, the Vinayadhara there Mahāsiva. From this one may safely infer that the other theras, who appear in the list between Upatissa and this Siva and whose names do not occur in the Commentaries, also lived during the same period. They are Upāli, Mahānāga, Papphanāsa (Paduma ?) and Cūladeva. The absence of the names of any theras of a later date in this list enables us to fix a probable date for the Parivāra. The compilation of the book may have been had an earlier beginning, but basing our inference on the fact mentioned above, it may be legitimate for us to deduce that it assumed its present shape in the earlier part of the first century A.D.

At the period we are now discussing the Bhikkhusaṅgha, too, was in a prosperous condition. We are told that King King Kuṭakarna Tissa's mother entered the Order,² and that

1. We may incidentally infer that the two theras Bhaddapāli and Khema, whose names occur immediately before Upatissa's, belonged to the first century B.C.

2. Mv 34.35

the king built for her a nunnery known by the name *Dantagaha*.¹
He built also a bath for the bhikkhunis.²

Bhātika
Abhaya.
38-66 A.D.

We now pass on to the reign of the next king *Bhātika Abhaya*, son of *Kutakampa Tissa*. His reign of twenty-eight years proved a period of peace and prosperity to Ceylon and in consequence the religion of the land was very much benefited during it. His worthy activities to support the sasana are described in detail in the *Mahāvamsa*.³ and need not be reproduced here.

The *Manorathapūraṇī* describes an interesting experiment which *Bhātiya* tried at the *Mahāsetiya* to verify a statement of the Buddha that the perfume of the jasmine surpasses all other perfumes.⁴ So averse was he to the slaughter of animals for food that he made the eating of beef an offence punishable with fine.⁵ The *Samantapāsādikā* has another valuable episode narrating how he issued a proclamation that he would punish anyone who, in any matter of dispute, would not abide by the decision of the *thera Abhiṣaṃmika Goḍha*. This proclamation was issued as the king was delighted at the satisfactory manner in which *Goḍha* gave his decision in a case of theft brought up before the chapter at *Cetiyaḡiri* and later brought

-
1. Mv 34.36
 2. Dip 20.33
 3. Mv 34.37 foll.
 4. Man En 811
 5. SV 440

up in appeal at the time before the chapter at the Mahāvihāra. The case was instituted by a bhikkhu at Antarassamāda-vihāra against another bhikkhu for stealing a drinking vessel made of coconut shell.^{1a} Without much doubt we can identify this Goḍha with the thera of the same name and who was a contemporary of Mahāpaddana and Mahāsuvanna.¹

We have the name of one other thera belonging to the same period, and that is of Cūlābhaya Sumana, who was foremost among the teachers of the Vinaya at the Mahāvihāra.² At that time there were five great monks

At the time in question there were ^{five} great monasteries³ in Anurādhapura, and the greatest number of bhikkhus came to Anurādhapura from the south.⁴

Before concluding this chapter it would be helpful to make a few general observations on the period from the writing down of the Texts upto the reign of Bhātika Abhaya.

In the last chapter it was pointed out that in the opening years latter part of the first century B.C. there occurred among the saṅgha a change of attitude, which was of vital importance and which, in my opinion, was a turning point in the Buddhist life in Ceylon. When the theras of the earlier

^{1a} - Supp II 587

1. Supp III 588. See also *ibid.* II 430, 478

2. *Ibid.* II 305

3. The Mahāvihāra, Thūpārāma, Issarasamānārāma,

Vessagīrivihāra and the Cetiyagīrivihāra .

(See P.L.C. p 56)

4. Supp II 306

part of the first century B.C. (It i.e. about in the time of Dutthagāma) are compared with those of the first century A.D., we see that the former were more ~~simple~~ saintly than learned, while the reverse is true of the latter. I need not repeat here the probable causes ~~that~~ that led to this change.

Again, as observed before, the Pāli Commentaries give the names of over twenty theras belonging to this period and quote many of them as authorities, whereas they are almost silent on the teachers who lived after the middle of the first century A.D. As far as I am aware, there are only two such theras¹ mentioned in the whole of the commentarial literature.²

An explanation is evidently needed for this silence. And the explanation is, in my opinion, that it was in this period, that not only the Parivāra but also the major portion of the Sinhalese Commentaries came to be put into definite shape. There is another piece of evidence to be examined. As it has been pointed out briefly in an earlier chapter, Buddhaghosa tells us in his *Samantapāsādikā* that the Vinaya was brought to Ceylon from India by Mahinda and was handed down up to 'the present' day (~~revelation~~ up to today) by the unbroken

1. Namely, *Leṇugirivāsi* Tissa in the reign of Mahādāthika Mahānāga 67-79 A.D. (Man Sn 669) and Mahāpaduma in the reign of Vasabha 127-171 A.D. (Snp II 471). A thera known by the name *Māgga Mahāsattthivassa* flourished during the same reign. He was a saint, and we have no evidence to think that he was a teacher.

2. Except, of course, the names of the commentators and their contemporaries of the 5th century A.D. as mentioned in the prologues and epilogues to the *Atthakathā*s.

line of teachers, and then proceeds to give, on the authority of the *Porāṇas*, the list of those teachers. If *vijāṇitānī* referred to the time of Buddhaghosa we should find the list to contain the names of theras up to the fifth century A.D., but, as was shown before, no thera after the first century A.D. is mentioned there. It should now be clear that the Sinhalese equivalent of *vijāṇitānī* was there already in the Sinhalese Vinaya Commentary and that Buddhaghosa's task was merely to put it into Pāli. This fact, too, directs us to the same inference with regard to the date of the compilation of the Sinhalese Commentaries. These Commentaries, no doubt, experienced additions, subtractions, systematizations and corruptions at the hands of teachers learned and otherwise during the next three centuries, until they were translated into Pāli by Buddhaghosa and his successors.¹

Taking into consideration all the foregoing facts we may not be far wrong in supposing the first century A.D. as the first literary period in the history of Buddhism in Ceylon.

periods later than the 1st cent. A.D.
 1. Events referring to the second and third centuries A.D. are found now and then in the Commentaries. E.g. see mention of *Asiraddhāna* (middle of second century) in *Śūp* II 297, and of *Mahanāga* (334-361 A.D.) in *Śūp* III 519. But such references as these are exceedingly few.

CHAPTER VI

The Growth of Dissident Schools

It was observed in an earlier chapter that the first century B.C. marked a turning point in the history of Buddhism in Ceylon. The closing years of that century saw the first schism in the saṅgha. How Vattaḡāmaṇi Abhaya constructed the Abhayagirivihāra and gave it to his friend, the theraja Mahātissa, and also how the dwellers of the Abhayagiri seceded from the Theravāda school are described in detail in the Mahāvamsa.¹ The Nikāyasamgraha adds that Mahādāliyāṭṭissa² accepted the teachings of the Dhammaruci Nikāya belonging to the Vajjiputtaka³ sect in India and that thenceforth the Abhayagiri school was known as the Dhammaruci Nikāya.⁴

The Mahāvamsa is silent on the existence of any heretical sect for nearly another three centuries. So are the Pāli Commentaries on the whole. But a passage in the Samantapāsādikā throws considerable light on the events of that period. During the reign of king Bhātiya (38-66 A.D.) a dispute arose between the monks of the Abhayagiri and the Mahāvihāra

1. Mv 33.80 foll.

2. Bahalamassa Tissa of Mv 33.96

3. For the views of this school, see Points of Controversy Intr. p xviii

4. Nikāyasamgraha, Colombo 1922 p 11

schools over a rule in the Vinaya. Arguments were adduced by either party to prove its own case but no settlement could be arrived at. The news of the dispute reached the king who then appointed a minister, the brāhmaṇa Dīghakārāyana, wise and versed in 'other languages' (paṇḍita bhāṣantarakhyasālo), to decide the case, which the latter did successfully.¹ The person who was appointed to solve the problem was not an ecclesiastic reputed for the knowledge of ^{the} ~~his~~ Doctrine but a layman proficient in languages. From this fact one may justly infer that the ground of difference between the dwellers of the two monasteries was, in this case, more of a linguistic than of a doctrinal nature. The Abhayagiri school, as we shall see later, was greatly influenced by Mahāyānaism in which the Canonical Texts were preserved not in Pāli but in Sanskrit. Perhaps at the time of this dispute the Abhayagiri school was already using Sanskrit versions of the Canon. The choice, too, of a brāhmaṇa minister who, needless to say, must have been well versed in Sanskrit, lends support to the same hypothesis.

in
Majjhīma

Mahānāga.
67-79 A.D.

The sāṃsa continued to flourish uninterrupted for another quarter of a century. Bhātiya was succeeded by Mahādāthika Mahānāga, who was an equally pious monarch. Many and varied were his works to help the sāṃsa.²

1. Snp III 582, 583

2. For details see IV 34.68 foll.

The Mahāvamsa describes how his generosity was extended towards the bhikkhus as well as the bhikkhunīs in the island.¹ He risked his own life at the ^lAmatthala ~~rupa~~ thūpa.² The great festival Giribhaddapūjā performed after the construction of this thūpa is mentioned more than once in the Commentaries.³ In connection with this festival occurs, too, the name of the therā, Tissa of Lopagiri,⁴ who was noted for the particularly virtuous life he led. Mention may also be made of two rock inscriptions at Melāhitiya-velegala recording certain gifts given by this king and by his brother Bhātiya to the saṅgha.⁵

Amādagāmanī

Abhaya
79-89 A.D.

Though short it was, the reign of Amādagāmanī Abhaya, son of MahāAśoka, was one of peace not only to man but also to bird and beast as well. Himself a strict vegetarian he forbade the killing of any kind of living beings and encouraged the cultivation of vegetables throughout the country.⁶

The condition of Ceylon during the next two centuries was not very enviable. The country was often

1. MV 34.82 foll.

2. Ibid. 34.71

3. Man I 22, Man Sn 670, Pap II 398

4. Lopagiri in Man Sn 669

5. Ep.Zey. III pp 153 foll.

6. MV 35.6 foll.

disturbed by internal political strife and consequently the religion, too, suffered considerably.

In the reign of Amantagāmani's younger brother and successor, Kapirajāputissa, we witness an instance of severe punishment being meted out to some bhikkhus for taking part in a political strife.¹

In the Atthakathās there is hardly any reference to incidents that took place during this period. The Mahāvamsa is practically the only source for the history of Buddhism at this time, and I do not propose to reproduce here the facts given in that Chronicle. There are, however, a few rock inscriptions recording the gifts of certain kings belonging to the second century after Christ.²

Vasabha
127-171 A.D.

There was again a definite revival in the time of Vasabha (127-171 A.D.). During his long reign of forty-four years, he tried in manifold ways to promote the study and teaching of the religion.³ He supplied the bhikkhus who were students with all the necessary requisites⁴, and we have every reason to believe that Ceylon once more became the abode of many scholars.

THE

1. Mv 35. vv 10, 11

2. See Ep. Zey. III pp 153 foll. and pp 162 foll.

3. Mv 35.72 foll.

4. Ibid. 35.92

The *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* tells us how he rejoiced when he heard the *Dīghabhāṇaka* theras preaching the *Mahā-suddassana Sutta* at the *Ambalatthikā* to the west of the *lobha-pāsāda*.¹ The same Commentary gives an episode connected with a virtuous therā who became an Arhant at the last moment of his life. King *Vasabha* paid his respects to the therā just before the latter passed away.² Mention is made of another therā who was put to test by *Vasabha* to find out whether the former was an Arhant or not.³ Two other theras who lived about the same time were *Mahāsiva* and *Mahāpaduma*. The former gave *Vasabha* a detailed account of things enshrined in the *Mahābhūṭa*.⁴ The latter was noted for his knowledge of medicine though, conforming himself to the *Vinaya* rules, he did not use that knowledge to acquire personal gain.⁵

The *Perumtiyankulam* Rock Inscription records a grant made by this king to a therā named *Majibuka*.⁶ Further, the construction of a *vihāra* and the grant of it to the Buddhist fraternity by this king's son *Vaṅkanāsika Tissa* are recorded in the *Mā-ulpata* Cave Inscription.⁷

1. *Sum Vil II* 635

2. *Ibid.* I 291

3. *Pap Sn* 869

4. See Geiger: *Mahāvamsa* and *Dīpavamsa* p 36

5. *Sap II* 471

6. *Ep. Zey.* I 66 foll.

7. *Ibid.* I 146 foll. Wickremasinghe identifies the *Isakka Tissa* of the inscription with *Vaṅkanāsika Tissa*.

Gajabāhu

174-196

A.D.

An event of importance but one that affected the purity of the religion in Ceylon, took place in the reign of the next king Gajabāhu. Twelve thousand Colian prisoners were brought by him from South India and they settled down in the country. Along with these Colians came also the cult of many Hindu gods and goddesses, such as Viṣṇu, Kartikāya, Nātha and Pattini, which cult has persisted up to the present day.¹

Vohāra

Tissa
269-291
A.D.

Passing over the first half of the third century² we now come to the reign of Vohāra Tissa. He stands out resplendent in the history of Ceylon as the first Singhalese king who enacted a law setting aside bodily injury as punishment for the offenders of the law.³

Abhayagiri
School.

The Abhayagiri School which was formed in the reign of Vattagamani Abhaya became an independent centre of learning. It was mentioned before that a dispute arose between this school and the Mahāvihāra fraternity

1. P.L.G. 50

2. Belonging about to this period there are several inscriptions which record gifts to the monkhood. See Ep Zey. I pp 21, 61, 62, 148, 211; III 116, 166, 214 foll. Among these ~~xxx~~ ~~xxx~~ One inscription (I 252) records the particular attention paid by king Kanīṭṭhatissa (227-245 A.D.; according to Wickremasinghe c.229-247 A.D.) to the Abhayagirivihāra.

in the time of King Bhātiya. Both the monasteries, however, received simultaneous patronage from many Sinhalese monarchs,¹ and though the differences seem to have grown slowly but steadily they did not make themselves felt strongly until the time of Vohāraṇa Tissa. The Nikāyaśāṅgraha² informs us that in the reign of this king, the dwellers of the Abhayagirivihāra put forward the Vaitulya Pitaka³ as the true teaching of the Buddha. According to this ~~the~~ Chronicle the Vaitulya Pitaka was produced in the time of King Asoka by heretical brāhmanas called Vaitulyas who had assumed the guise of monks to destroy the sāsaṇa. Then the monks of the Thēriya Nikāya (i.e. those of the Mahāvihāra) compared it with the authentic Texts and rejected it as being opposed to the Dhamma. Hearing this, king Vohāraṇa Tissa appointed his minister Kapila, proficient in all branches of learning, to investigate the matter. Kapila gave his verdict that the Vaitulya Pitaka was not the true Doctrine. The king, thereupon, caused the Vaitulya books to be burnt and disgraced the evil-minded bhikkhus who accepted these teachings.³

Though their books were destroyed, the spirit of the heretics remained uncurbed. Hardly a score of years had lapsed when the monks at Abhayagiri came forward again and proclaimed the heretical teachings to be the true Doctrine. This

1. See P.L.C. 52

2. The Vaitulya teachings referred to in this passage are, according to Paranavithana, identical with the teachings of Mahāyānism. See S. Paranavithana: Mahāyānism in Ceylon, Colombo 1928, p 36.

3. Nikāyaśāṅgraha p 11. See also P.L.C. pp 53, 54.

happened in the reign of Gothābhaya.¹ Not all the monks of the
 Abhayagirivihāra were of this view. A
 Gothābhaya great there, Ussiliyātissa by name, heard
 309-322A.D. that the manner in which the heretics were
 disgraced by Vohāraka Tissa, took with him
 three hundred bhikkhus who would listen to his advice, left the
 Dharmaruci Sekt and settled down in the Dakkhipagirivihāra.² The
 Sāgaliya reason that led to this secession was
 Sekt. evidently not the expectation of forming a
 new sekt but the hope of not committing the
 same blunder as was committed by the previous generation at
 Abhayagiri. Things, however, took a different turn. A there
 called Sāgala, from among the seceders, became the chief ex-
 pounder of the faith and this led to the formation of a new
 school Sāgaliya named after this same teacher. The Nikāya-
 saṅgraha gives the formation of this sekt as 795 years after
 the Buddha.³

The proclamation of the Abhayagiri Sekt reached the ears of Gothābhaya. The king then assembled the monks of the five chief monasteries and learning that these Vaitulya doctrines were not the teachings of the Buddha, branded and sent out of the country sixty monks who had accepted the false teachings.

1. Also called Gothakābhaya. MZ IV 36.98
 2. Nikāya-saṅgraha p 12
 3. Ibid. p 12

The troubles did not cease with this. Some of these monks went over to Kāvira and lived there. At this time a shrewd and persevering man, Saṅghamitta by name, got into their fold and hearing the disgrace wrought by Gothābhaya on them, left for Ceylon with the firm determination of making the Mahāvihāra monks accept the Vaitulya teachings or of destroying the vihāra itself. Saṅghamitta soon won the favour of the king and became the tutor of the king's two sons Jetṭhatissa and Mahāsena. Though Gothābhaya had a great regard for Saṅghamitta, his attachment to the Mahāvihāra proved too strong to bring any harm upon it.

<p>Jetṭhatissa 323-333 A.D.</p>	<p>Saṅghamitta was able to win the young prince Mahāsena over to his ways of thinking but Jetṭhatissa showed a different disposition towards him. Therefore, when Jetṭhatissa ascended the throne, Saṅghamitta, through fear of him, fled to Kāvira. Jetṭhatissa reigned for ten years and was succeeded by Mahāsena. Saṅghamitta, realizing that his long expected moment had come, came over to Ceylon, and residing</p>
<p>Mahāsena 334-361 A.D.</p>	<p>at the Abhayagirivihāra, tried to make the dwellers of the five chief vihāras accept the Vaitulya teachings. Finding his attempt unsuccessful, he induced Mahāsena to make a proclamation that "whoever gives alms to a bhikkhu dwelling in the Mahāvihāra is liable to a fine of a hundred</p>

pieces of money ". This proclamation had the desired effect. Three days the monks of the Mahāvihāra went their usual begging round but received no food whatsoever. On the fourth day they assembled at the Lohapāsāda and decided to face death rather than accept false views. With this firm resolve in mind, they left Amurādhapura, some going to Rohana and others to the Malaya provinces.

Śaṅghamitta seized the opportunity and receiving the aid of a minister named Sopa, caused the king to demolish three hundred and sixty-four colleges and monasteries. The wealth which belonged to these was transferred to the Abhayagiri vihāra. The Dharmartisans who thus came into power, appropriated the Cetiyavihāra and made that place a part of their residential quarters.

The Dipavamsa tells us that when Mahāsena came to the throne he found two sections of monks and while attempting to find out which party was the virtuous, he fell into the clutches of the sinful ones including Dummitta (the bad Mitta) and Pīpasopa (the evil Sopa). These two names, no doubt, there is little doubt, refer to the Śaṅghamitta and the Sopa of the Mahāvamsa. Among the heretical views taught by them were (1) that " computing the twenty years required for the Upasampadā ordination from the conception, which has been admitted by the Buddha in the story about Maṇḍarakasapa, was not allowable, and

(2) that the practice of wearing ivory fans which has not been admitted in the story about the Chabbaggiyas, was allowable."¹

At this time one of the king's own ministers, Meghavannābhaya, raised a rebellion. The revolt was not to gain power for himself but to end the disasters that befell the Mahāvihāra. However, no blood was shed, for Mahāsena overcame by the good faith of his minister promised to restore the buildings demolished by him. Meanwhile, Saṅghanitta who was mainly responsible for all the mischief, was done to death by a certain carpenter at the instigation of the chief queen. The queen then collected the Vaitulya books and offered them to the fire-god. The minister Sona, too, met his death at the hands of some enraged citizens. The king was as good as his words, and restored the Mahāvihāra. He built also many vihāras including the two nunneries Uttara and Abhaya.² The bhikkhus who were in exile for nine years returned to Anurādhapura.

But Mahāsena was not steadfast in his convictions. Saṅghanitta was now dead, but the king directed his admiration this time towards an equally evil-minded therā, Maṅk Kōhontissa by name, dwelling in the Dakkhinagiri-vihāra, and began to build for him the Jetavana-vihāra within the precincts of the Mahāvihāra. The latter monks in the latter monastery objected to this, but the king was determined to put his scheme into action. In this obstinate perseverance, he was supported

1. Dīp 22.67 foll.

2. Mv 37.43

by the Abhayagiri fraternity. In due course the work was of the completed Jetavana-vihāra was completed and Mahāsena gave it to his friend. Kohontissa was, before long, accused by the monks of the Mahāvihāra of an extreme offence. Dhammika, a Justice in the court of Mahāsena, was appointed to conduct the case. Kohontissa was proved to be guilty and, much against the wish of the king, was disrobed and expelled from the Order. Thereupon the monks of the Sāgaliya Sect came over from Dakkhinagiri and settled down in the newly built Jetavana-vihāra.¹ It should be observed that this sect, though it had no connections with the orthodox Mahāvihāra, did not accept the Vaitulya doctrines until the time of Ambaherapa Samanvan of the sixth century A.D.¹

Siri Megha-
vappa.

Mahāsena was succeeded by his son Siri Meghavanna.² He restored the buildings destroyed by his father³ and did all in his power to help the Mahāvihāra in preserving the teachings of the Buddha in their pristine purity

A very important event took place during the reign of this monarch, and that was the bringing over to Ceylon of the Tooth Relic of the Buddha from Kalinga. The

-
1. This is a summarized version of the account in the Nikāyasangraha pp 12-15 and Mv 36.111-123; 37.1-39. For details see P.L.O. 56-63
 2. A rock inscription belonging to the reign of this king is given in Ep Zey. III 172 foll.
 3. Mv 37.54-91

Pāli poem *Dāṭhāvamsa*, based on earlier works in Sinhalese, deals with the history of this Relic.¹ It should be observed that though Meghavamma was devoutly attached to the Mahavihara, he was very tolerant to the Abhayagirivihāra which was the seat of mischief in the days of his father, for we find that he decreed that the Relic should be brought every year to the Abhayuttara² vihara, and that the same sacrificial ceremonial as observed at the Temple of the Tooth Relic should be observed there also.³

Buddhadāsa

Passing over the reign of Meghavamma's successor Jetthatissa, we come to Buddhadāsa, the great royal surgeon. The description of him as an eminent surgeon, who devoted his entire life to the good of man and beast, is given in detail in the *Mahāvamsa*.⁴ During the reign of this king the thera Mahadhammakāthi translated the Suttas into Sinhalese. We have no other records concerning this thera. The probable reason for this enterprise of Dhammakāthi and the changes that took place during this period with regard to the relative importance of the Sinhalese and Pāli languages in teaching the Doctrine are discussed fully by Malalasekara in his *History of Pāli Literature of Ceylon*⁵ and therefore need not be dealt with here.

1. For more details see P.L.C. 65-69 and Mv 37.92-97.

2. Another name for Abhayagiri.

3. Mv 37.97. This practice was observed even at the time when the Chinese pilgrim Fa Hien (c.400-445 A.D.) visited Ceylon. See Beal: *Travels of Buddhist Pilgrims*, p 157

4. Mv.37.105-171. For a Pillar Inscription belonging to this reign, see Ep Zey.III 122

5. P.L.C. 71-74.

Upatissa

Buddhadāsa was succeeded by his eldest son Upatissa. In the time of this king the island was visited with the double ill of a famine and plague. The king is said to have organized a chanting of the Ratana Sutta to avert these misfortunes.¹

'This account of the ceremony given in the Mahāvamsa is interesting, in that it is the first recorded instance of the Parittan having been recited for the public weal, the only other occasion being the one on which the Buddha himself is traditionally said to have preached the Ratana-Sutta to banish a deadly plague from Vesālī'.²

Mahānāma

409-431 A.D.

Upatissa met his death at the hands of his queen consort who had an intrigue with Upatissa's brother, Mahānāma. The latter was at that time leading the life of a monk, but after the murder of his brother, he gave up the robes to take in hand the reins of the government and then married Upatissa's consort.

From the account given in the Mahāvamsa it is evident that he was not favourably disposed towards the dwellers of the Mahāvihāra. He created several viharas and presented them to the bhikkhus of the Abhayagirivihāra, whereas he gave only one to the Mahāvihāra; and that too not of his own accord but at the instigation of his queen.³ The reason

1. Mv 37.189-198

2. P.L.C. 75

3. Mv 37.213

perhaps
for taking this attitude was ~~probably~~ that when he was a monk
he probably belonged to the Abhayagiri fraternity.

Mahāsena is the last monarch belonging to the period under consideration. An event of prime importance that occurred during his reign marks the beginning of a new era in the history of Theravāda Buddhism. That event was the translation into Pāli of the Commentaries that existed from the time of Mahinda up to that day in Sinhalese, and which we have discussed at the very outset of this work. It is worthy of notice that the two most important events, namely, the writing down of the Pāli Texts at the Aloka-vihāra and the translation of the Commentaries into Pāli, both took place during the reigns of kings who were not favourably disposed towards the Mahāvihāra and who actively helped the opposing camp, the Abhayagirivihāra.

As we have seen before, the Mahāvihāra came into open conflict with the dissentient schools only on a few occasions, namely, in the reigns of Vattagāmaṇi, Bhātiya, Vohāra Tissa, Gothābhaya and Mahāsena. The Atthasālinī records a controversy that arose at a meeting where the holders of all the different views were present (sabba-sāmayika saṃgama). Some monks in that assembly held the view that the Abhidhamma Piṭaka was not preached by the Buddha.¹ This was clearly opposed to the orthodox view. Unfortunately for us, we are unable to find out when this dispute arose. It is quite possible

1. Att 28. This same view was held by the Mahā-saṅghikas who were the first to form a school distinct from the Theravādins. See Dip 5.37

that such meetings were frequently held and that the friendly disposition of monks belonging to one school towards those of another was not ^{usually} affected by the mere fact of their holding different views.

The dissenters, however, did not remain idle. We have every reason to believe that they, especially the Dhammaruciāns, were striving hard to propagate their views. When Fa Hien visited Ceylon in the first or the second decade of the first century A.D., he found more bhikkhus living in the Abhayagiri-vihāra than in the Mahāvihāra, the actual numbers being 5000 in the former and 3000 in the latter.¹

Abhayagiri
Fraternity.

It may incidentally be remarked that the Abhayagiri-vihāra continued to flourish for several centuries to come. An inscription of the eleventh century gives a glowing description of this vihāra. It records that Abhayagiri was then a monastery 'where dwelt bands of scholars directing their wisdom to great literary works and adorning the Abhayatūṭṭā-maha-sā, just as a flight of garudas hovers with widespread wing over rows of serpents on the Himālayan range; which resounded with the voice of those versed in the scriptures, expounding the Dharma; which was adorned by virtuous men as by by mines of gems; where flourished like unto an assemblage of coral tendrils members of Sakya Sramanas (Buddhist monks)

1. Beal; Travels of Buddhist Pilgrims, p 151,159.

endowed with the virtues of temperance, contentment and religious austerity ; where frequented various teachers of eminence ; and over which presided the Head of the Dhammaruci (fraternity) ' 1

The dwellers of the Mahāvihāra, Fa Hien tells us, were opposed to the Great Vehicle (Mahāyāna) and adhered to the teaching of the Little Vehicle (Hīnayāna) , whereas the Abhayagiri school studied both vehicles, and widely diffused the Tripitakas.² When Fa Hien left Ceylon he took with him a copy of the Vinaya Pitaka of the Mahīśāsaka School, the Dirghāgama and the Saṃyuktāgama (Sūtras) and also the Saṃyuktasaṃghaya-pitaka, all written in Sanskrit.³ Very likely these books were taken away from the Abhayagiri where, as pointed out some before, it is possible that Sanskrit was the language in which the Canonical Texts were preserved. Among these books the Saṃyuktāgama was translated into Chinese by one Guṇabhadra who arrived in the province Kan in 435 A.D. Though he was born in Central India, he went to China from Ceylon.⁴ Another Ceylonese, Saṅghavarman by name, arrived in China in 420 A.D. and translated the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya.⁵

Mahīśāsaka
School.

No reference to the existence of
the Mahīśāsaka Sect in Ceylon is recorded
in the Mahāvamsa or in any commentarial

-
1. Ep Zey. I pp 225, 226
 2. Beal; Buddhist Records of the Western World. Vol II
 3. Legge; Travels of Fa Hien p 111 (p 247
 4. H. Anesaki; Letter published in J.R.A.S. 1903 p 369
 5. Ibid. p 368

work excepting the Jātakatthakathā. Here, too, the reference is in a verse belonging to the prologue and not in the main part of the book.¹ The commentator mentions the name of Buddhadeva, a monk belonging to the Mahīśāsaka Sekt, as one who requested him to compose the Atthakathā in Pali. This fact together with the choice made by Fa Hien concerning the copy of the Vinaya Piṭaka enables us to conclude with some justification that the Mahīśāsaka Sekt was a well established school in Ceylon, though perhaps not so influential as the Dharmaruci Nikāya.

Vitanda-
vādins.

Besides the schools mentioned above, we often come across in the Commentaries references to the Vitandavādins.²

They are always depicted as putting forward views contrary to those held by the Theravādins. The Sumaṅgalavilāsinī gives a sarcastic description of the nature of this a Vitanda-conversation. Their argument^h would be, the commentator says, "A crow is white because its bones are white; a crane

1. J I pt p. 1. verse 9.

2. Occurs also as Vidadhuvādin (Att.3). Stede defines the word Vitandavādin as a "sophist" or an "arguer". (P.T.S.Pali Dictionary). The word Vitanda occurs in Sanskrit literature, too, and Monier Williams in his Sanskrit-English Dictionary defines it as "cavil, captious objection, hypercriticism, perverse or frivolous argument (especially in the Nyāya phil., idly carping at the arguments or assertions of another without attempting to establish the opposite side of the question), frivolous or fallacious controversy or wrangling, debate, criticism (in general)".

is red because its blood is red."¹ The Vitapjavādiṇs differed not with regard to the Text but about the interpretation of it. They sometimes adhered strictly to the letter and lost sight of the meaning.² They quoted as authority the same Suttas as were accepted by the Theravādiṇs.³ At times the latter would pour forth blame upon the Vitapjavādiṇs for quoting a Sutta, the meaning of which they (the Vitapjavādiṇs) had not properly grasped.⁴ At the end of a dispute in which the defeat is, of course, always with the Vitapjavādiṇ, he is invariably made to appear ridiculous.⁵

The disputes are on doctrinal topics all of a varied nature.⁶ There is , however, a reference in the Attasālinī which shows that the Vitapjavādiṇs did not accept the Kathavatthu as an a book of the Abhidhamma Piṭaka , but had instead the Mahābhikkhūśāstra*. Now in Manjio's Catalogue of the Chinese Tripitaka there are mentioned two books: the Abhidharma-hṛdaya-śāstra (No 1288) and the Dharmajina-Abhidharma-hṛdaya-śāstra (No 1294). The first is said to be an Abhidharma book of the Hinayāna.⁷ It was composed by the venerable Dharmajina (?) and translated by Gautama Saṅghadeva,

1. Sum VII I 91. Also see Man Sn 831

2. Pap Sn 821

3. Pap II 363; Pap Sn 671

4. Pap Sn 572

5. Att 93, 241; Pap Sn 572, 671, ItA 147-149

6. See Att 90, 93, 241; Man Sn 848; ItA 147-149;

SV 9, 51-54, 319; Pap II 363, PapSn 572, 671, 821, 1026

7. Catalogue p xvi

* Att 3.

together with Hwai-yuen, A.D. 391, of the Eastern Tsin dynasty A.D. 317-420. The second was compiled by the venerable Upatissa and translated by Narendrayana, A.D. 563, of the Northern Tsi dynasty, A.D. 550-577. But we are unable to say definitely whether the Mahādhammādaya of the Vitandavādins had any connection with these or not.

The Dipavamsa, too, has a reference which may not be overlooked. Referring to the reign of Vohāra Tissa, the Chronicle records that wicked bhikkhus proclaimed Vitandavādas and destroyed the religion of the Jins ; but the king, when he perceived that, subdued those wicked ones with the aid of the minister Kapila.¹ As pointed out earlier, the Mahāvamsa and the Nikāyasaṅgraha refer to this same event and declare that the Abhayagiri School accepted the Vaitulya teachings and sought to destroy the pure Doctrine. This solitary reference is not sufficient to identify the Vitandavādins with the holders of the Vaitulya teachings, but with the evidence before us, we may be justified in concluding that they were a class of Buddhists who, though accepting the same Canonical Texts (with the single exception of the Kāthāvatthu) as Theravādins did, were not bound strictly by each and every dogmatic exposition of the latter.

The influence of one other heretical sect on Theravāda Buddhism remains to be mentioned. That sect is the

1. Dip 22. vv 43,44

Lokottaravāda
School

is ~~the~~ Lokottaravāda School who believed that the Buddha was supernatural.

When a great spiritual teacher passes away it is natural for his followers to pay little attention to the human aspect of his life and to deify him. This they do with deep veneration for their leader. The process being a natural one, it is also possible that the attempts of the Ceylonese Buddhists to give a supernatural colouring to the life of the Buddha came about without the direct influence of the Lokottaravāda School which prevailed in India. Whatever the reasons were, there is not the least doubt that the Theravādins, too, who 'adhered strictly to the realistic view of the person of the Buddha their Master' did tend to some extent towards making the Buddha supernatural. We shall now deal with one or two ~~of~~ out of a considerable number of cases where this tendency is evident.

1. The Jara Sutta of the Samyuttanikāya refers to an occasion when the Buddha, during a sojourn near Sāvathī, was one day seated and was warming his back in the sunshine.

"Then the venerable Ananda came to see the Exalted One, and on coming to him saluted him and, while chafing his limbs with his hands, said to the Exalted One : 'It is a strange thing, lord ! It is a wonder, lord, how the skin of the Exalted One is no longer clear and translucent, and how all his limbs are slack and wrinkled, his body bent forward, and a change is

to be seen in his sense-faculties of eye, ear, nose, tongue and body !'

'So it is , Ananda. Old age is by nature inherent in youth, sickness in health, and death in life. Thus it is that my skin is no longer clear and translucent as of yore; my limbs are slack and wrinkled, my body ~~is~~ stoops forward and a change is to be noticed in my sense-faculties of eye, ear, nose, tongue and body.' ¹

This dialogue leaves no doubt whatever concerning the Buddha's own admission as to his being subject to decay during his old age. Let us see what the Commentary has to say on this. The bodies of the Buddhas, explains the Commentary, do not get wrinkled. What ~~he~~ led Ananda to make that remark was a solitary wrinkle between his shoulders. It was the size of a hair and was seen only by Ananda. Nor was the Buddha's body bent forward to any extent that could be observed by others. Ananda, alone, being a close attendant of the Buddha, was able to notice it. The power of the five senses had altered by no means. Ananda said that there was a change not because he perceived but because he inferred a change ! ²

This attitude taken by the commentator (or ^{is} commentators) ~~was~~ very much akin to the standpoint of the Lokottaravādin as depicted in the Mahāvastu. ³

1. S.Vol.5 pp 216, 217. Also see Kindred Sayings Vol 5

2. A SA Sn III 193,194

3. Mahāvastu . Vol I p 169

2. The *Majjhimnikāya* gives us an instance where the Buddha, after giving a discourse for some time¹ at the newly built Sathāgāra Hall at Kapilavatthu, asked Ananda to continue the discourse and retired as a pain arose in his back.² The Commentary, while admitting that the body of the Buddha was not inaccessible to disease, tries to show that the pain was an exceedingly small one but the Buddha made use of the opportunity because he desired to use the hall in all the four postures of walking, standing, sitting and lying down.³

Space does not permit me to discuss here more references of a similar nature.⁴ In fairness, however, to the Theravādins, it must be mentioned that though the inevitable tendency to make the Buddha supernatural existed, they did not proceed far in that direction but adhered strictly to the realistic view of the person of their Master' more than any other school of Buddhism did. The progress (or rather the corruption) attained by other schools in this line is shown with clearness by Prof. Takakura in his article 'Docetism' in Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*.⁴

A few words remain to be said of a class of literature that did not belong to the orthodox Canon. The

1. M. I. p 354

2. Pap Sn 581

3. For more examples see Man II 379; J I 50, 53, 64, 68; Sum VII I 58, II 434 foll; BuA 241; Pj II (2) 401; SA Sn III 193, 194, 198.

4. Also see N. Dutt. *Early History of the Spread of Buddhism* pp 246 foll.

teachings of the Buddha were open to everybody and there was nothing esoteric or hidden in them.¹ But a few centuries after

Secret
rites.
Destinies.

his passing away, esoteric books came to be composed and we find them prevalent even in Ceylon, the home of the orthodox Doctrine. There is reason to believe that ~~many~~ secret books were studied by the Theravādins themselves and that receiving instructions in such secret books from a teacher was a special privilege of the well-behaved pupil. This is evident from a passage in the Visuddhimagga which says : "Again, in entrusting himself (i.e., a student-bhikkhu) to a teacher, he should say 'Myself I offer to you'. For he who has not so entrusted himself is unruly, stubborn, takes no advice from no one, or goes about at his own will, without asking leave of the teacher. And the teacher favours him not with things of the flesh or of the Doctrine, neither does he teach him any secret booklore (gūḥya saṁdāya na sikkhāpeti). Not getting this double favour he gets no foothold in the religion and before long reaches a wicked or worldly state."² The Visuddhimagga, being one of the most authoritative books on matters dealing with the Theravāda School, we may legitimately infer that the state of affairs depicted in this passage was what obtained among the orthodox circles in the time of Buddhaghosa.

1. See D.II.p 100

2. P.P.II 135; VI I 115

This inference is strengthened by the existence of similar passages in the *Papañcasūdanī*¹ and in the *Manorathapūraṇī*². The bhikkhus who do not treat their teachers properly, these two Commentaries say, would not receive from the latter training in *Ekā* the *Sīlī* or the *Aṭṭhakathā* or the Compilation of Doctrinal Discourses (*Dhammakathābandha*) or the Secret Books (*Gūḍhasūtra*). We are unable to say what the *Dhammakathābandha* was. Perhaps it included books that formed the basis of the later *Tikkā* and works like the *Rasa-vāhinī*. The secret book (or class of books) mentioned in these passages was, no doubt, one *saṃśyāsāhita* accepted by the Theravādins. There were also other books dealing with secret doctrines but rejected by the orthodox schools on the ground that they were not the teachings of the Buddha. Such were the *Vannapiṭaka*, *Angulinālapitaka*, *Paṭṭhapālagajjita*, *Alavakagajjita*, *Gūḍha Uvaggā*, *Gūḍha Vessantara* and *Gūḍha Vinaya*.³ Nevertheless, the *Samāgala-vilāsinī* and the *Manorathapūraṇī* present a more conciliatory attitude in advocating not a wholesale rejection but the rejection of only those books which, after examination, are found not found to be conducive to the restraint of passion and other defilements. The books mentioned in these two Commentaries are the last

1. Pap II 264

2. Man Sn 854

3. Sap Sn II 5. The *Saratthappakasini* (II 201) gives the same list with the exception of the *Gūḍha Uvaggā* and with the addition of the *Sūṭṭhā Vajāpīṭaka* - or the *Vedallapīṭaka*, according to some recensions - and calls these books 'counterfeits of the true teachings'.

three in the foregoing list and the Vedallapitaka.¹

In addition to these there were other compilations, which were not recited at the three councils but seem to have been accepted by the Theravādins. They were the Kulumba Sutta, Rājovāḍa Sutta, Tikkhindriya Sutta, Catuparivatta Sutta, Mandopanama Sutta,² the five Kathāvatthus : Dhātukathā, Āramanākatthā, Asubbakathā, Nānavatthukathā and Viḷḷāḍakathā;³ the Maggakathā and the Buddhikarandaka.² According to the Samantapāsādikā there was an analysis of the thirty-seven bodhirakkhiya dhammas in the books Maggakathā, Āramanākatthā, Buddhikarandaka, Nānavatthu and the Asubbakathā.² The Mahādhātukathā⁴ which was accepted by some in place of the Kathāvatthu in the Abhidhamma Pitaka was perhaps the same as the Dhātukathā in this list. The Theravādins rejected it as there was nothing new in it (Mahādhātukathāyaṃ aṅgabbhaṃ paṭṭhi). Another such book called Silāpadāna was considered to have been composed by Sariputta there.⁵

It is unfortunate that we do not have any further information about most of these books. The Nikāya-saṅgraha is of considerable help in this connection. According to this Chronicle the authorship of some of these books are as follows:

-
1. Sam VII II 566; Man Sn 579
 2. Sap Sn II 5
 3. SA II 201
 4. Att 4
 5. Sap Sn II 5.

Book	Author
Vaṅṇapitaka	Hemavatika School
Angulimālapitaka	Rājagiriya ,,
Śūlha Vessantara	Siddhatthaka ,,
Ratthapālagaṇṇita	Pubbaseliya ,,
Klavakagaṇṇita	Aparaseliya ,,
Śūlha Vinaya	Vāḍḍiyya ,,

Information on these as well as on many other books seems to have been available in Ceylon till as late as the fourteenth century, for Dharmakīrti, the author of the *Nikāyaśāhgraha*, cuts short his account saying that it would be too long a task to describe separately how these books were composed.¹

Nanjio's Catalogue of the Chinese Tripitaka, too, is of some help, though the books that could be traced - and without much certainty either - to any in the Chinese collection are very few, the number being only three, namely, the *Rājovāda Sutta*, the *Angulimālapitaka* and the *Ratthapālagajjita*.

1. Rājovāda Sutta.

There are four Suttas having the title *Rājāvāda*: viz., Nos. 248, 249, 250 and 988 of the Catalogue. The last, called also the *Fo-shuo-shan-sium-wān-su-wān-sin* (Buddhabhāsita-Prasanaṇṇi-rāja-pariprocchā-sūtra), is probably

the one in our list, and, according to Nanjio, it is mentioned in the Tibetan Catalogue O'-yuen-lu under the heading of the Sūtras belonging to the Hinayāna.

2. Aṅgulimālāpīṭaka

There are three Sūtras having the name Aṅgulimālā (Nos. 434, 621 and 622). No 621 is called the Fo-shwo-yāp yān-ōu-no-ōi (Sūtra spoken by the Buddha on Aṅgulimālā). This is said to be a Sūtra belonging to the Hinayāna.¹

3. Rāṣṭrapālāpīṭaka

Three works bearing titles similar resembling this are given in the Catalogue.

(a) No 23 (18). Rāṣṭrapāla-pariprocchā,

(b) ,, 594 Fo-shwo-lāi-ohā-hā-lo-ōi (Sūtra spoken by the Buddha on Rāṣṭrapāla),

and (c) ,, 873 Rāṣṭrapālāpariprocchā.

No 594 belongs to the Hinayāna.²

The Nikāyaśāgraha mentions also that there were three classes of non-orthodox literature which originated in India and, later, were brought to Ceylon. They were the works expressing the views of the Vaitulya and the Vājirīya Schools and also works embodying the sciences such as the Ratnakūṭa.³ Nanjio's Catalogue gives a whole series of works

1. See Nanjio's Catalogue pp xv and 152.

2. Ibid. p xv

3. Nikāyaśāgraha p 9.

belonging to the Ratnakūṭa class.¹ It is said in the Nikāya-saṅgraha that the Ratnakūṭa Sāstras were composed by the Andhaka School and the Ratthapālagaḥjita by the Pubbaseliya.² In ~~Manjish~~ Nanjio's Catalogue ~~Rāstrapāl~~^{Rāstrapāl}apariprocā (No 23/18) belongs to the Ratnakūṭa class, and hence it, too, should be a work of the Andhaka School. There ~~it~~ is thus an apparent discrepancy if the Rāstrapālapariprocā is the same as the Ratthapālagaḥjita. But, on further consideration, it becomes clear that there is no discrepancy as the Pubbaseliya was only a sub-sect of the Andhaka School.³

From the survey made in the preceding pages it is not difficult to see understand the influence which the unorthodox schools had on the Theravādins. Whenever occasion arise the Theravādins spared no pains in resisting the inroads of the heretical doctrines and they were successful when the latter came into open conflict as during the reign of Mahāsena. The Theravādins, however, gradually and unknowingly succumbed when the heretical teachings came not in the nature of producing schisms but of tending to make the Buddha and events connected with his life appear supernatural. An interesting account of an event of that description

-
1. Eighty-six works in all (Nos 23- 60, No 23 containing 49 Sāstras).
 2. Nikāya-saṅgraha p 6
 3. See Mrs Rhys Davids; Points of Controversy, Intr. p xliii.

is given by Fa Hien. When he was residing in Ceylon he heard a monk from India, seated under a high tree reciting a sacred book and giving the past and future 'history' of the Buddha's bowl-relic. This 'history' was one episode of miraculous happenings. At the end of the discourse Fa Hien wished to copy it down, on which the monk said, "This is no sacred book, but only what I have learned by memory and repeat verbally". Though Fa Hien, with the historical and literary exactitude of his race, wished to know the authenticity of that sermon it is not likely that it would ever have occurred to the ordinary man in the audience to make any such inquiries. We may, therefore, not be far from the truth if we say one that it was heretical influences of this nature that found their way into Theravāda Buddhism and obtained a permanent abode there.

1. Beal: Travels of Buddhist Pilgrims pp 161-164.

No.	81	82	83
-----	----	----	----



CHAPTER VII

Where the Faith flourished.

We have already seen how within a short time after the advent of Mahinda, Buddhism spread through the length and breadth of Ceylon. What we have discussed as far was the evidence of the Pāli Commentaries with regard to the spread of the religion and also the many vicissitudes through which it passed, considered as far as possible, in their chronological order. The Commentaries contain also an abundance of information pertaining to events connected with the history of the faith, but which cannot be treated chronologically, as many of the references give no clue whatsoever to the time of the occurrence of an event about which the reference is made. A helpful way of making use of these invaluable references is to treat them from a geographical aspect, that is to say, to group them according to the places mentioned therein and thus make an attempt to make reconstruct the history of the different localities where the faith flourished. The references to Getiyagiri, however, form a fortunate exception in that we are able to arrange many of them in chronological order.

One other preliminary remark should be made; that is, though we are unable to give a connected chronology, we can, with a fair degree of accuracy, lay down the upper

and lower limits. The former ~~is~~ ~~was~~ is evidently the time of Mahinda's advent to Ceylon in the middle of the third century B.C. The extreme lower limit is the early part of the fifth century A.D. when the Commentaries were written in Pāli by Buddhaghosa and his successors. But in an earlier chapter it was pointed out that the compilation of the main part of the Sinhalese Commentaries was, very likely, completed by about the middle of the first century A.D. We may, therefore, not be far wrong if we consider the description of the Buddhist centres to be discussed in the present chapter as depicting mainly the state of affairs during the first three centuries after the arrival of Mahinda. It should also be remarked that the places to be mentioned in this presently do not go to form the whole list of those referred to in the Commentaries. Our attention here will be mainly directed to places which we have had no occasion to discuss in the preceding chapters.

Cetiya-pabbata.

We shall start with Missakapabbata or Cetiya-pabbata, the modern Mihintale (Mahinda-thala), where the first sermon was delivered by Mahinda. At the time when the Commentaries were compiled Mihintale was known by the name Cetiya-pabbata or Cetiya-giri. This name was given to it on

1. For a full list of the places see Appendix I b.

account of the many shrines built there.¹ The mountain is situated about 8 miles to the east of Amuradhapura.² It has three peaks and 'each peak is crowned by a dagāba. The ascent to a table land between two of the peaks is assisted by a flight of nearly two thousand steps of granite, each 20 feet broad'.³ The northern peak was known as the Silakūta. Immediately below it lies the little tableland on which the Ambatthala-dagāba stands.⁴ Very likely the Therambatthala mentioned in the Visuddhimagga and the place of the same name where the there Mahārohanagutta is said to have lived are identical with this Ambatthala.⁵

The mountain has many caves which once formed the peaceful abodes of many a Buddhist hermit. The best known of these caves is the Mahindagūha or the 'Cave of Mahinda'. Buddhaghosa mentions Hatthikucchipabbhāra and Mahindagūhā as examples of places for meditation for people with an inquiring turn of mind. Dwelling in a place of this nature which is hidden by the forest and at the mouth of a cleft, enables such a person to concentrate his thoughts.⁶ The Papancaśūlani mentions the name of another cave at Cetiya-pabbata. It is the

1. Mv tr. p 114 note 3

2. Ibid p 89.note 3

3. T.W. Rhys Davids in Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics Vol 3.p332. For further details see H...Cave; Book of Ceylon pp 526-535.

4. Mv tr.p 90 note 1

5. V1 I 155, II 375; Also see Att 187

6. V1 I 110; P.P.II 128. I do not agree with Huang Tin in taking Hatthikucchipabbhāra-Mahindagūhā-sadiya-senāsana as 'in a dwelling like Mahindagūhā on Hatthikucchipabbhāra.

cave called Piyāṅga. The thera Lomaṣa Māga lived here.¹

The Cetiyagīrivihāra was so well known as an abode of the holy ones that it became an unsuitable place for quiet meditation, for when a bhikkhu lived there people would gather to honour him thinking that he was an Arahant. The same was true with regard to the monasteries such as Dakṣiṇagiri, Maṭṭhiṇīcchi and Cittalapabbata.²

Cetiya-pabbata became an important place from the very beginning. Mahinda made his abode there to spend the first rainy season,³ and this, no doubt, attracted many people to the place. When the southern branch of the sacred Bodhi Tree was brought by Saṅghamittā to Anurādhapura, a sapling from the seeds of that branch was planted at Cetiya-pabbata.⁴ The demise, too, of Mahinda occurred in the same place, when he was spending the rainy season there,⁵ and his name was further commemorated by King Uttiya by building a thūpa on the Cetiya-mountain enshrining a portion of his relics.⁶

The next reference in the Commentaries to Cetiya-pabbata is concerning an event which took place about hundred years later. The thera Maṅgaliyadeva, who lived in the time of King Duṭṭhagāmiṇī, preached the Chachakka Sutta here and sixty theras attained Arahantship.⁷

1. Pap I 78

2. Vi I 120

3. Snp I 83

4. Snp I 100

5. Mv 20.32

6. Ibid. 20.45

7. Pap Sn 1024

During the reign of Saiddhātissa, the younger brother of Dutthagāmaṇi, there lived in this vihāra the thera Kāla Buddhārakkhita, receiving the respect of the king and imparting religious instructions to a large number of bhikkhus.¹ The king was once observing the uposatha-sīla or the eight precepts in the King's at Cave (Rājalena) at Cetiyapabbata, and, as mentioned on a previous occasion, listened one whole ~~whole~~ night to a discourse delivered by a certain pinḍapāṭika there. The king was greatly pleased at the saintly life of the bhikkhus there and gave alms to them daily, while he acted rather indifferently towards the bhikkhus at Anurādhapura.²

The famous Dīghabhāṇaka Abhaya who flourished during the reign of King Dutakapṇa Tissa³ lived in this vihāra. At that time a powerful bandit, Abhaya by name, the head of a large number of other bandits, encamped near Anurādhapura and lived by pillage and plunder. The people of Anurādhapura feared to cross the river Kalasba and the road to Cetiyapabbata was left untrodden. One day the bandits went to plunder the Cetiyapabbatavihāra. Dīghabhāṇaka Abhaya, hearing of their arrival, treated them with hospitality, and we are told that that they, overcome by the kindness of the thera, were converted and thenceforth became protectors of the vihāra.⁴

1. Pap II 294

2. SV 473. The reason for taking this attitude has already being discussed elsewhere.

3. A visit of this king to Cetiyapabbata is mentioned in SA I 34 and Pap Sn 653.

4. Pap II 474, Att 399

The Mahavihara seems to have regained the prestige lost at the time of Saddhātissa, for we find that in the reign of king Bhātiya (38-66 A.D.) Cetiyapabbata occupies an ecclesiastical position less important than that of the Mahā-vihāra, as is evidenced by an appeal made to the Mahavihāra by a bhikkhu who was dissatisfied with a decision given by the chapter at Cetiyapabbata.¹

Bhātiya's ~~successor~~ ^{son}, king Kumbhavarman Tissa (xñ successor, king Mahādāthika Mahanaga caused a great festival called the Giribhandapūjā to be held at the Cetiyapabbata. The magnificence with which the festival was held is given in considerable detail in the Mahāvamsa.² It is said that a shower of hot cinders fell on this occasion and the Visuddhimagga attributes it to an action of Māra, the Evil One.³ Mention is made several times of the thera Lanagirivāsī Tissa, who, as a result of ~~his~~ his special merit, received the best gifts at this festival.⁴

Cetiyapabbata did not escape the notice of the Chinese traveller Fa Hien. He records 'Forty li to the east of the No-Fear Shrine ⁵, there is the sacred mountain Mihintakula, with a shrine on it called Bhadraka, in which there are about

1. Sup II 306

2. Mv 34.75 foll.

3. Vi II 376

4. Sum VII II 534, 535; Pap II 397 foll.; Man Sn 669, 670

5. i.e., the Abhaya (giri) vihāra.

two thousand priests. Among them is a Shamen, the Reverend Dharmagupta, whom all the people of this country respect and look up to. He has dwelt in a stone cell for more than forty years; and by ~~constant~~ constant exercise of kindness of heart he has succeeded in so influencing snakes and rats that they will live together in the same cell without hurting one another!¹

There are references to a few other theras but to whom we are unable to assign any definite date. They are:

1. Mahātissa thera, who attained Arhantship while on his way from Cetiyapabbata to Amurādhapura.²
2. Lemasa Māga thera, already alluded to before, who was noted for the ability to bear with intense cold,³
3. the paṇṣukhika thera of Pacinakhandaṛaḍḍi, well known for the purity of his life,⁴ and
- 4 & 5. two brothers who adhered strictly to the dhutaṇṇa practices.⁵

In connection with Cetiyapabbata mention should also be made of the village Dvāramandālā.⁶ A large number of young men from this village are said to have entered the Order, following the lead of ~~Abhaya~~ Abhaya, Devānampiyatissa's brother.⁷

-
1. H.A.Giles: Travels of Fa Hien pp 71,72.
 2. Vi I 20. 194
 3. Pap I 78
 4. Sum VII III 1010
 5. Vi I 62
 6. Mv tr. p 68 note 1
 7. Sum I 90

Anurādhapura

From Mihintale we now turn to Anurādhapura . Being the capital of the country, there is good reason to suppose that the monasteries at Anurādhapura received greater attention from the Sinhalese monarchs than those at other places. Whenever the vastness of a place in India is desired to be shown, it is customary in the Commentaries to make Anurādhapura the standard of comparison, as it was the biggest city in Ceylon.¹ Not only was it the biggest city, Anurādhapura could also be rightly called the Madhyadeśa² of Ceylon.³ Fa Hien has recorded in words of admiration his impressions of the city. He says : "In the city there are many Vaiśya elders and Sabaen merchants⁴ whose houses are stately and beautiful. The lanes and passages are kept in good order. At the head of the four principal streets there have been built preaching halls, where, on the eighth, fourteenth and fifteenth days of the month, they spread carpets, and set forth a pulpit, while the monks and commonalty from all quarters come together to hear the Law."⁵ The Visuddhimagga, too, records an instance of a bhikkhu expressing his opinion that conditions at Anurādhapura were as good as they could

1. See SA II 194; DhA I 398; ApA 219

2. Madhyadeśa (the Middle Region) was, to the Buddhist, the most sacred portion of India.

3. Man II 37

4. According to Legge these 'merchants were Arab forerunners of the so called Moormen who still form so important a part of the mercantile community in Ceylon'.

5. Legge: A Record of Buddhist Kingdoms, p 104

have been in a place where the Buddha himself lived. "Thupārāma;" he says, "is a place where the relics of the four Buddhas were deposited. In Lohapāsāḍi it is convenient to get a hearing of the Teachings. It is, as if it were, in the time of the Buddha."¹

The Mahā-
vihāra

The most important and very likely the biggest² monastery in Anurādhapura was the Mahāvihāra. It was this monastery that preserved for^{wa} the teachings of Theravāda Buddhism. We have already seen under what trying circumstances the dwellers of the Mahāvihāra preserved those teachings from the devastating influence ^{of} of the Vaitulyavādins. The vihāra was built by king Devānampiyatissa shortly after the arrival of Mahinda.³ It was situated to the south of the city⁴ and appears to have comprised more than one building. Piyāṅguparivana, the name of one of the buildings is mentioned in the Samnāvavinodanī.⁵ There was also a separate pavilion for the discussion of questions (Paṭhamasāḍa).⁶ Bhikkhus who came from other parts of the island to worship the Mahācetiya and

1. Vi I 91.

2. As may be inferred from the references in DhA IV 74; Snp Sn II 314; Sam Vii II 578 etc.,

3. The whole of Mv, ch 13 is devoted to the description of the acceptance of the Mahāvihāra by Mahinda.

4. CuNā 108. To the east of the city was the monastery Uttamasīvi-vihāra. But of this we have no information given in the Commentaries.

5. Sv 292.

6. SA Sn III 151.

and the Mahābodhi, used to make their temporary abode at the Mahāvihāra.¹ The fame of the monastery spread far and wide and people even from abroad went there in search of the pure teaching. The names of Viśākhā,² Pīṭimallo³ and Buddhaghosa may be mentioned as examples.

Though the Mahāvihāra was one of the most flourishing monasteries in ancient Ceylon, it was however not without its periods of adversity. It was abandoned during the Brāhmanatissa famine and during the several Tamil invasions. Also during the reign of king Mahāsena the dwellers of the rival monastery Abhayagiri caused the king to harass the Theravādins at the Mahāvihāra.⁴ It was in a prosperous condition when Hsü Fa Hien visited Ceylon. At that time there were 3000 bhikkhus living in it. The Chinese traveller describes in detail the cremation of the remains of an eminent bhikkhu who lived there and who was considered by the people as an Arāhant.⁵

In the fifth century when Buddhaghosa wrote his Commentaries, the views held by the Mahāvihāra school were considered to be unmixd and unentangled with the views of other (heretical) sects;⁶ and all the Commentaries,

1. SV 292, 446, 449, 451; Sum VII III 1011

2. V1 I 312

3. Pap I 234; Sum VII III 748

4. These, as well as the conflicts which the two rival vihāras had, have been discussed in detail in earlier chapters.

5. Beal: Travels of Buddhist Pilgrims pp 139, 160. The chief there in the time of king Candamukha Tissa was also an Arāhant. (Pap Sn 869).

6. Att 2.

including the *Vimuddhimagga*, were written with their contents based on the tradition of the *Mahāvihāra*.¹

Closely connected with the *Mahāvihāra* are the *Lohapāsāda* (the Brazen Palace), the *Mahācetiya* (also called *Mahāthūpa*, *Sonnenli-cetiya* or *Huvanvālisāya*) and the *Mahābodhiṭṭhāna* (the Place of the Great Bodhi Tree).

The nine-storeyed Brazen Palace built
Lohapāsāda.

in the early part of the first century B.C.

by King *Dutthagāmanī* was the *Upasathigara* (the house where the Vinaya activities were performed) of the *Mahāvihāra*. It rested on sixteen hundred monolithic columns of granite, and at present only these pillars remain to mark the spot where the once magnificent building stood. The construction of the *Pāsāda* is described in full in the *Mahāvamsa*.² The importance of this building was so great that Mahinda is said to have paid his reverence to the spot on which it was to stand at a later date.³ There was always a large number of bhikkhus in the building⁴, and it was one that *Anurādhapura* could well boast of.⁵

Attached to the *Lohapāsāda* were two meeting places, the *Ambalatṭhikā* and the *Pāṭṭanikāyaṇaṇḍala*. The former

1. See Vi I 2; Pap I 1; J I 1; UḍA 2; Kv 1

2. Kv ch 27. Also see H.W.Cave: *Book of Ceylon*
pp 548-550

3. Snp I 101

4. DhA III 472.

5. Ibid. IV 74. For comparisons bearing out its
size size, see / BA I 74; UḍA 101;
Pap II 185.

was situated to the east of the building. Mention is made twice of the Dīghabhāṣakas assembling there to recite the teachings. Once they recited the Brahmajāla Sutta¹ and on the other occasion, when king Vasabha was also present, they recited the Mahāsaṃvāsana Sutta.² We are unable to say exactly what the specific purpose of the Paṭicaniḍḍiyasāpāṭala was. Perhaps it was a common meeting place of the Bhāṣakas of all the five Nikāyas of the Sutta Piṭaka. We have records of more than one meeting held at this place. Tipitaka Cūḍābhaya there once proclaimed that he would preach here from the three Piṭakas.³ The Dīghanikāya Tīkṇī tells us that a Dhammasaṃgīti (a recital of the Doctrine) was held at the same place under the auspices of the Mahāvihāra.⁴ The Sumaṅgalavilāsinī records that it was customary for the bhikkhus residing in the country to the north of the Mahāvāḷigaha to come to the Mahāvihāra to spend the rainy season. At the end of their stay they would assemble at the Paṭicaniḍḍiyasāpāṭala in the Lohapāsāḍa. Here those who knew the ~~Texts~~ Texts would recite them and those who knew the Commentaries would recite the Commentaries. If during the course of the recitation anyone made a mistake, it was immediately pointed out and rectified.⁵

1. Sum Vīl I 131

2. Ibid. II 635

3. Vī I 96

4. Pap I 197 foot note 1

5. Sum Vīl II 52 581

We have also a few references to different theras preaching the Doctrine at the Lohapāsāda. Mahiyāsīva, as a thera of fame in the day of Duṭṭhagāmaṇi, preached the Ghachakka Sutta.¹ His contemporary Mahāvyaḍḍha is also mentioned (on another occasion) to have performed certain Vinaya rites in the same building.² Other theras who expounded the Doctrine here and whose names are recorded in the Commentaries, are Tipiṭaka Gūḷaniga,³ Tipiṭaka Gūḷābhaya⁴ and Gaṇavāsi Sumanadeva⁴

Mahācetiya

Of a more permanent structure than the Lohapāsāda was the Mahācetiya, which, too, was built by king Duṭṭhagāmaṇi.⁵ It was considered unique in the quantity of relics enshrined in it, and hence it was supposed to be the "~~Asadisa Mahāthūpa~~" (The Greatest Cetiya without a parallel)⁶. Its size, too, was considered to be the biggest that a cetiya could be expected to be built of.⁷ According to tradition the relics that were to be enshrined in this cetiya were reserved for that purpose by Mahākassapa thera when king Ajātasattu deposited the relics of the Buddha, a short time after the latter's passing away.⁸ Further, it was

1. Pap Sn 1024

2. ~~Sk II 226x~~ Man II 247

3. SA II 276

3a. Vī I 97

4. Att 31

5. An account of its construction was given in an earlier chapter. For further details see Hv .abb. 28-31; Cave : Book of Ceylon pp 550-561. An idea of its architecture can also be obtained from SV 293.

6. Pap Sn 699.

7. Man II 5; Sum Vīl II 578

8. Sum Vīl II 611

held that the Buddha, in one of his visits, sanctified the site of the cetiya by taking his seat there,¹ and also that Mahinda venerated the place by offering it flowers.² According to another tradition the Mahācetiya is one of the places which would be visited by the relics just before the Dhātuparinibbāna (the extinction of the relics) which is to take place in the future.³ There is no doubt at all that this cetiya was one of the most sacred treasures of the early Ceylonese Buddhists. Keeping the cetiya in good condition⁴ was considered as a privileged duty not only of the layman but of the bhikkhu as well. The Papañcasūdanī gives an instance of a thera who took part in the white-washing of the cetiya.⁵ The only other object of worship that was perhaps on a par with this was the Mahābodhi. There are many references to people going to worship the cetiya and the Bodhi Tree.⁶ In this connection mention may also be made of an interesting episode of a minister (apaccā) who offered jasmine flowers to the cetiya and shared the merit with Yama, the ruler of the Underworld. As a result

1. Snp I 89. Also see I 92.

2. Ibid. 101

3. Sum VII III 899; Pap Sn 882

4. It was neglected only in such disastrous times as that of the Brāhmanatissa famine. At that time, as pointed out elsewhere, it was neglected to the extent that castor plants grew on the cetiya. (SV 446)

5. Pap II 403

6. See e.g., SV 292; Pap Sn 698; VI I 143

of this, the story proceeds, he was able to escape the torments of hell and to take birth in a world of the devas.¹ The *Saratthappakāsinī* tells us that the sight of the Mahācetiya was capable of producing sublime emotions in the hearts of devotees and that numberless bhikkhus attained Arahantship by developing and reflecting on those emotions.²

Bodhi Tree.

The Bodhi Tree dates from the time of Mahinda. The *Sarantapāsādikā* describes how it was brought to Ceylon and was planted in the Mahameghavana at Anurādhapura.³ It is, as far as we know, the oldest historical tree in the world.⁴ We have already mentioned in connection with the Mahācetiya how bhikkhus used to come from various parts of Ceylon to offer their veneration at this tree. This practice continues down to the present day. Even the non-Buddhist Tamil invaders, who from time to time destroyed many a vihara, left this tree untouched. As Cave observes "that it escaped destruction by the enemies of Buddhism throughout many invasions is perhaps attributable to the fact that the same species is held in veneration by the Hindus who, while destroying its surroundings monuments, would have spared the tree itself."⁵

1. Man II 231; Pap Sn 955

2. SA Sn III 151

3. Snp I 90-100. Also see Mv. ch.19 and *Sarantapāsādikā* Cave's Book of Ceylon pp 542-544

4. See *I Ceylon* by J.E.Tennent pp 613-615.

5. Cave: Book of Ceylon p 544.

The Commentaries , excepting the *Samantapāsādikā*, do not throw any light on the history of this sacred tree or on the buildings that were erected in course of time round it in course of time.¹

Thūpārāma.

To the south of the city of Anurādhapura stood the Thūpārāma-vihāra,² the dāgāba of which exists up to the present day.³ The latter was built by King Devānam-piyatissa, and is situated 400 yards north of the Ruvanvāli-dāgāba.⁴ Its construction and how the relics were brought to be enshrined in it are given in detail in the *Samantapāsādikā*.⁵ According to tradition the site of this cetiya was sanctified by the Buddha by entering into the trance called the *nirodha-samāpatti* at this place place⁶ and it was also believed that relics of all the four Buddhas (i.e., Kakusandha, Konāgamana, Kassapa and Gotama) were deposited at the same place.⁷ This belief resulted in making the Thūpārāma cetiya also one of the most venerated spots in Anurādhapura.⁸ We find it mentioned along with the Mahābodhi and the Mahācetiya as places worshipped by a large number of bhikkhus who came to Anurādhapura

-
1. A Mahābodhi-vāra-kotthaka (gateway of the Mahābodhi) is, however, mentioned in *SumVil III 1011* and *Man Sn 523*.
 2. *Mv tr. p 118* note 2. Also see *SA I 222; UdA 238*.
 3. See *Wave : Opus cit. pp 538, 539*.
 4. *Mv tr. p 230* note 2.
 5. *Snp I 83* foll.
 6. *Ibid. p 89*.
 7. *V1 I 91; Snp I 86*
 8. *V1 91*.

after the Brahmagatissa famine came to an end.¹ The sanctity of the place was enhanced by the planting of a sapling produced from a seed of the sacred Bodhi Tree.²

Among other references in the Commentaries to events connected with this place [may be mentioned

- (1) a remark about two theras of Amurādhapura, who entered the Order at the Thūpārāma and one of whom was noted for his ~~stupid~~ absence of attachment to property,³ and
- (2) an episode connected with a thera who is said to have met at its gate two Yakkha children.⁴

Further, a gift made by king Gajabāhu to the community of monks at Thūpārāma is mentioned in the Pāli Mahicāva Rock-inscription.⁵

Issara-
samapārāma
Vessagiri.

Two other important vihāras in Amurādhapura were the Issarasamapārāma⁶ and the Vessagiri-vihāra. They were included in the five great monasteries (pañca maha-vihāra), the other three being the Mahāvihāra, the Thūpārāma and the Cetiyavihāra⁷. But we are unfortunate in having hardly any information in the Pāli

-
1. SV 451
 2. Snp I 100
 3. J. V. 254
 4. Pap Sn 713
 5. Ep Zey. I 208 foll.
 6. Now called Issurummiya
 7. See P.L.C p 56.

Commentaries about these two monasteries. As far as I am aware there is no reference to Vessagiri and there is only one to Issarasamanārāma. And this, too, is not a very important one by itself, being an incidental reference to the planting of a sapling of the sacred Bodhi Tree there by king Devānampiyatissa.¹

The construction of the latter vihāra is attributed to Devānampiyatissa². It is situated about a mile to the south of the Mahāvihāra.³ As found at present it is a 'curious' building carved out of the natural rock.⁴ Vessagiri, too, was built by the same king.⁵ From the silence of the Commentaries on these two monasteries we have room to infer that, perhaps, they did not occupy an important position prior to the compilation of the Sinhalese Commentaries.

Abhayagiri
vihāra

Outside the northern gate of the city stood the Abhayagirivihāra.⁶ It was built by king Goṭhābhaya on the place where existed a monastery of the Niganthas. As Geiger has shown, tradition appears to have confounded the name of the Abhayagiri-dāgūba with that of the Jetavana-dāgūba and, therefore, the site of the

1. Sup I 100

2. MV 20.14

3. MV tr.p 133 note 2.

4. See Cave; Book of Ceylon pp 554,555.

5. MV 20.15. Wickremasinghe gives a description of this place, in connection with the inscriptions found there. See Ep Zey. I pp 10 foll.

6. See Beal; Travels of Buddhist Pilgrims pp 150,151.

former monastery must be sought where the now so-called Jetavana-dagāba stands.¹ The Abhayagirivihāra, being the headquarters of the Vaitulyavādins in Ceylon, played a very important part in the history of Buddhism in the island. This question has been dealt with in detail in the chapter on the "Growth of the Dissident Schools".

Maricavattī
vihāra.

In the south-west part of Amurādhapura and to the west of the Mahāvihāra stood the Maricavattī-vihāra, the dagāba of which exists today under the name of Kirisavattiya.² The vihāra and the cetiya were built by king Dutthagāmanī.³ A festival on a very large scale was held by the king at the consecration of the vihāra. As it was mentioned earlier in another occasion, an account of an incident which occurred at this festival is given in several of the Commentaries.⁴

Dakkhīnagiri
vihāra.

The Dakkhīnagiri-vihāra, which for some time was the headquarters of the Sāgaliya Sect, was, as is indicated by its name (dakkhina - south), situated to the south of the city. This vihāra is mentioned in the Commentaries⁵ as well as in the Mahāvapasa.⁶ It was built by king Saddhātissa.⁷

and p 24 note 1
1. Mv tr.p 235 note 1. Also see Wickremasinghe's discussion of the Jetavanārāma Inscription of Malu-tissa. Ep Zey. I 253.

2. Mv tr.p 179 note 2.

3. For details see Mv. ch.26.

4. Pj II 71; CuNīA 79; ApA 128; Pap II 145.

5. Man II 172

6. Mv.33.98

7. Ibid.33.8.

At one time it was famous as an abode of saints.¹ The then Kala Buddhārakkhita belonged to a neighbouring village and when he grew up he entered the Order at this vihāra.² Buddhārakkhita, we are told, became the teacher of a large number of bhikkhus, but, on the advice of his preceptor, went to Vāṭakamitapabbata-vihāra and there by strenuous meditation became an Arhant.³

Other vihāras mentioned in the Commentaries as belonging to Amurādhapura are:

1. Chāṭapabbata. The mountain by this name is situated to the south of Amurādhapura.⁴ It was here that the treasures were found which Devānampiyatissa sent to his friend Asoka.⁵ A young bhikkhu residing in this monastery is mentioned as having come to grief, as far as his higher life was considered, on listening to a woman's voice.⁶

2. Kalambatittha-vihāra - a monastery on the banks of the Kalamba river.⁷ The Saratthappakāsinī gives an account of fifty bhikkhus who went to this vihāra to spend the rainy season. They decided among themselves not to talk to each other till they attained Arhantship and, it is said, within the

1. VI I 120

2. Pap II 293

3. Ibid. II 294

4. J.F.R.S. 1888. p 35

5. Snp I 74

6. Man I 26

7. Called also the Kadamba river; it is the present Malvatu Oya to the south of Amurādhapura.

See P.L.C. p 27 note 2.

three months of the rainy season they all fulfilled their ambition.¹

3. Kūṭelittissa Mahāvihāra . Only the name of this vihāra is mentioned in the Commentaries. A thera who went on a pilgrimage to Amurādhapura to worship the Mahacetiya and the Mahābodhi is mentioned as having arrived at this vihāra on his return journey.²

4. ⁿPaṇḍitakappārājī - a woodland solitude to the east of Amurādhapura. It was a place ~~very~~ very suitable for solitary meditation (natissallāpanāyāna ~~thāna~~). The Visuddhimagga gives an account of a thera who lived here for a long time and paid a visit to a friend of his at Amurādhapura.³ The Sumaṅgalavilāsinī⁴ and the Manerathapāraṇī⁵ mention another thera who lived in this place and went to the city in search of a garment as allowed in the Vinaya rules.

5. Paṭhamacetiya - the cetiya built on the first spot to which Mahinda and his companions came when they arrived at Amurādhapura. This place was to the east of the city.⁶ Here, too, was planted a sapling grown from a seed of the sacred Bodhi Tree.⁷

1. SA Sn III 155

2. EV 293; Pap Sn 699,700

3. VI I 90,91

4. Sum VII III 1010,1011

5. Man Sn 523,524

6. Sup I 79. Also see MV tr. p 95 note 2

7. Sup I 100

Aritthapabbata.

To the south-east of Anurādhapura and at a distance of about 30 miles from it ¹ is the mountain Aritthapabbata, the modern Ritigala. A vihāra called Mahāilaka was built at the foot of this mountain by king Śūratissa (187-177 B.C.).² Though no reference to any monastery here is made in the Commentaries it deserves our attention as some interesting inscriptions which may be assigned to about the first century B.C. have been found in this place.³

Nāgādīpa

The maritime region that lies to the north-west of Anurādhapura was known as Nāgādīpa (the island of the Nāgas)⁴. A part of the present Northern Province also may have been included in the same. Perhaps it was a district which was predominantly, though not exclusively, inhabited by the Nāga people. According to the Jātakatthakathā Yakṣas^{5a} and Supannas^{4b}, too, lived there. It was customary for merchant vessels to call at Nāgādīpa to obtain water and food ^{fuel} ~~water~~.⁵ The Akitti Jātaka tells us that near Nāgādīpa there was another (is)land known as Ahidīpa, the name of which was later turned to Karadīpa⁶. Probably this was the ancient

1. As may be judged from the map of ancient Ceylon in Geiger's translation of the Mahāvamsa (facing page 1). Also see *ibid.* p 72 note 3

2. *Mv* 21.6

3. *Sp. 207. I* 135 foll.

4. *Mv* tr. p 6 note 2

5a. *J* II 128

4b. *J* III 187

5. *J* III 189

6. *J* IV. 238. Also see

CpA 19.

name of one of the *ma li* islands off the northern coast of Ceylon. These references in the *Jātakapīṭhakathā*, most likely, carry us to a date earlier than the colonization of the island by Vijaya and ^{his} followers.

Coming down to the period after the conversion of the island, we find in *Māgadīpa* a *cetiya* that attracted worshippers from many parts of Ceylon. The famous *Tipiṭaka* *Oḷlābhaya* there went there for worship ~~the~~ with a retinue of five hundred *bhikkhus* to worship the *cetiya*.¹ In the time of *Lenagīrivāsi* *Tissa* there another band of fifty *bhikkhus* went there for the same purpose.² We are not in a position to say definitely which this *cetiya* was. There ~~was~~ was one by the name of *Rājāyatana-cetiya*³ and another at the *Jambukola-vihāra* built by king *Devānampiyatissa*.⁴

Jambukola was the chief sea port of *Māgadīpa*, and probably of the whole island.

The branch of the Bodhi Tree was brought by ship to this port and from there was taken to *Amurādhapura*.⁵ During the *Brāhmapatissa* famine, when the *bhikkhus* sought to go over to India, they assembled at *Māgadīpa* and took ship at *Jambukola-pattana*⁶, and when the *thera* *Tissadatta* came from India to Ceylon he, too, disembarked at the same port.⁷

1. *SV* 457

2. *Pap* II 398; *Man* Sn 669; *Sun* VII II 534

3. *Sun* VII III 899. Also see *Mv* I.54

4. *Mv* 20.25

5. *Snp* I 98

6. *SV* 446

7. *Snp* Sn II 377

The *Saṃantapāsādikā* informs us that when ^{the} Tissaṇadatta arrived at Jambukola vihāra he saw Tissa, a young bhikkhu, cleaning the compound of the cetiya, and, from the manner in which the latter did the work, concluded that Tissa was one free from the defilements.¹ Very likely this Tissa is identical with Tissa, the son of Punabbasu-kutumbika, mentioned in the *Saṃnehavinodanī*.² The importance of the Jambukola monastery may be judged from the fact that one of the eight saplings sprung up from seeds of the sacred Bodhi Tree was planted there and also from the fact that pilgrims from as far a country as the Yonarattha came to worship its cetiya.³ The name of one of the monasteries (if not of the monastery) was Vālikavihāra.⁴

Mahatittha

According to the *Saṃnehavinodanī*, the bhikkhus who went to India during the great famine disembarked on their return journey at Mahatittha (the Great Port)⁵, the modern Mantota opposite the island Manaar.⁶ Perhaps Mahatittha was another name for the port at Jambukola.

1. Snp Sn II 377

2. SV 389

3. Snp Sn II 377

4. SV 389

5. Ibid. 448

6. Iv tr. p 60 note 1; J.P.T.B. 1888 p 67

Kalyāṇi

Coming from Mahatittha along the coast towards the south we arrive at the mouth of the Kalyāṇi river (*Kalyāṇi-nadi*), the modern *Ma Kelapi-ganga* in the District of Colombo. About six miles towards the inland and lying by the river is the famous Kalyāṇi-cetiya. According to tradition the Buddha visited Kalyāṇi twice and the cetiya stands on the spot where the Buddha sat down on the throne of jewels offered to him by the Nagas. It is also believed that in the cetiya is enshrined that throne of jewels.¹ Further, according to the *Saṃantapāsādikā* the Buddha entered into *nirodhasamāpatti* on that same spot.² We are unable to say definitely when the present cetiya was built. Cave gives the probable date as the thirteenth century.³ If there is any truth in the tradition attached to the episode concerning the Naga king *Maṇiakkhika*, the site of the present cetiya is perhaps not identical with that of the original one, for *Maṇiakkhika*'s residence is said to have been at the mouth of the river, the place now called *Mutwal* (Sinhalese *Modara* < *Muvadora* < *Mukha-dvara*)⁴. Associated with traditional sanctity, the cetiya, in times of old as now, attracted many devout worshippers. The *Saṃbohavinodanī* mentions an incident that happened about when

1. See *Mv* 1.44 foll.

2. *Snp* I 89

3. Cave: *Book of Ceylon* p 202

4. See *Dip.* 2.42foll.

about thirty bhikkhus were ~~xxx~~ returning after worshipping the ~~xxx~~ cetiya.¹

Kalyāṇi was a centre of Buddhism from very early times - perhaps from the days of Kaniakkhika, the Māga king, if there is any historical truth in the Mahāvamsa legend attached to this person. The name of the monastery occurs for the first time in the Mahāvamsa at about the middle of the second century B.C. Already at that time it was a well organized² vihāra and hence its establishment must have been earlier.² Mahiyadeva, who lived during the reign of Dutthagamani, is reported to have preached the Chachakka Sutta at two places in Kalyāṇi, namely, at the Nāgasaṅghavihāra and in the village Kalakacchagāma.³

In the Commentaries we have the names of a few other theras connected with the Kalyāṇi vihāra; e.g., Mahātissa⁴ and Godha. The latter is described as a thera noted for his punctuality.⁵ Several Commentaries mention also an episode connected with a young bhikkhu of this vihāra who went in his begging round to the village Kāladighavapiḍvara and, as a result of the same, came to disaster afterwards.⁶ The accounts

1. SV 295, 296: Pap Sn 701. For another instance of bhikkhus going for the same purpose, see Pap II 145.

2. See Mv 22.13 foll.

3. Pap Sn 1025

4. Pj II 6, 7; Vi II 689

5. Pap I 122

6. Pj II 70; Man I 23; Pap II 144; OUNIA 78.

in the several Commentaries differ somewhat from one another. The Apadāna Atthakathā records that this young bhikkhu was a reciter of the Dīghanikāya¹. Another therā, Dighasumma by name, lived in the vicinity of the mouth of the river. A fisherman, it is said, gave him alms on three occasions and, as a result of this merit, was reborn in a happy state.² It is interesting to note that this place (now Mutwal) is even today a chief fishing centre in Colombo.

Malaya

The central mountainous district from which the Kalyāṇī river takes its source was known in ancient days as Malaya-ratṭha. In times of foreign invasion it was often a place of refuge of the Sinhalese kings. It afforded also shelter to Buddhist monks when, as often happened, living in Anurādhapura was fraught with peril.

Sumanagiri

or

Adam's Peak

Sumanagiri, the mountain from

which flows, among other rivers, the

¹
Kalyāṇī-nadī, is at present one of the

most sacred spots to the inhabitants of

Ceylon. Its ~~an~~ modern name is Śrī-pāda-

kanda (the Mountain of the Auspicious

Foot) or Adam's Peak as the Europeans call it. It is believed that the Buddha, on his third visit to Ceylon, planted his

1. ApA 128

2. Pap Sn 1008

foot-print on the peak of this mountain.¹ The Hindus regard the mark on the summit resembling a human foot as the foot-print of Siva, 'and the Mahomedans, borrowing their history from the Jews, as with that of Adam'.² Its importance as a place of pilgrimage seems to have increased with the passage of time.

The Mahāvamsa states that in the time of king Duṭṭhagāmaṇi the thera Malayamahādeva (or Maliyadeva) received some millet-gruel from the king and shared it with nine hundred bhikkhus on the Sumanā mountain.³ The episode contains the miraculous element in it, but there is little doubt that it is based on tradition considerably earlier than the date of the composition of our Mahāvamsa. It is therefore likely that there was a monastery on the mountain.

A reference in the Commentaries, too, adds strength to this supposition. The Manorathapūraṇi tells us that Dīghajantu, the Daṁḍa, gave a red silk cloth as an offering to the Akasa-cetiya at Sumanagiri-vihara.⁴ This is a valuable piece of information both for what it says and as being, as far as I know, the only Aṭṭhakathā reference to this sacred mountain. From the Mahāvamsa we know that Dīghajantu was a warrior of the Tamil (Daṁḍa) king Elāra, the powerful enemy of Duṭṭhagāmaṇi.⁵ The word Akasa (sky)

1. Mv 1.77

2. For further details see Cave: Book of Ceylon pp 452-461.

3. Mv 32.49

4. Man II 230 . Also see Pap Sn 955

5. Mv. 25.54.

Cetiya shows clearly that there was a shrine on the peak of Sumanagiri. So high and abrupt in its ascent is the mountain that to one standing at its base the shrine on the peak appears to be situated in the sky, and "Abhaya Cetiya" is indeed a deserving name for it. The article, too, offered by Dighajantu is of significance. Even today one of the commonest offerings which the Tamil pilgrim takes to this sacred spot is a piece of red cloth - preferably silk, if he can afford it - with which he covers the foot-print.

Fa Hien also mentions in his records the existence of the foot-print.¹ It is, however, not till the time of King Vijayabahu I of the eleventh century A.D. that we find Sumanabala (called also Samantakuta) as a place of regular pilgrimages.²

Mutiyaṅgana
vihāra

The Mutiyaṅgana³ vihāra, situated in the present District of Badulla⁴ which coincides in some parts with the ancient Malaya, is also a place of historic importance. It was believed that the Buddha, on his third visit, ~~must~~ entered into nirodha-samāpatti on the spot where the Mutiyaṅgana cetiya stood later.⁵ According to the Papañcasūdanī the thera Maliyadeva

1. Beal: Travels of Buddhist Pilgrims p 150.

Also see an article on this subject by Beal in J.R.A.S. (New Series) Vol 15 pp 338 foll.

2. Mv 60.65

3. Also called Mutiṅgana (Pap Sn 1024).

4. Codrington: A Short History of Ceylon p 28.

5. Snp I 89

preached the Chachakka Sutta here.¹

Paṅgura
vihāra.

Another place in the Malaya district ² mentioned in the Commentaries but about which we do not ^{present} at present sufficient data to fix its exact geographical position is the Paṅgura vihāra in Hatthibhoga Janapada. The Paṇḍitaśāstrī records an instance of a young bhikkhu of this monastery reciting the Mahābhāṣa-saṁādāna Sutta.³

Rohana

We now come to the southern part of Ceylon known in ancient days as the province of Rohana. Buddhism was introduced to this region during the very first year of Mahinda's arrival in Ceylon. The nobles ~~in~~ of the two villages in Rohana, namely, Kājaragāma and Candanagāma, are reported to have come to Anurādhapura to take part in the festival held by king Devānampiyatissa on the occasion of the bringing of the southern branch of the Bodhi Tree by Saṅghamittā ⁴; and according to the Samantapāsādikā, a short time later, saplings grown from the seeds of that branch were planted in these two villages.⁵ The religion thus introduced into Rohana was placed on a firm footing by Mahānāga, a younger brother of Devānampiyatissa.⁶

-
1. Pap Sn 1024
 2. See Mv 35.vv 26, 29, 44
 3. Pap II 377
 4. Mv 19.54, 55.
 5. Snp I 100
 6. Mv 22.9

On several occasions Rohana and Malaya served as places of refuge to the defenders of the faith in Ceylon. Thus when the greater part of the island was devastated by Tamil invaders in the second century B.C. these were the only two provinces that were safe from their attacks. The once resplendent light of Buddhism was almost wholly extinguished in Anurādhapura by the Tamils but they were unable to extend their harmful influence towards the south. Referring to Rohana of that period the Mahavamsa remarks : "In Rohana there are still princes who have faith in the three gems."¹ Nearly a century later when Ceylon was visited by a devastating Brahmaputissā- peril, the bhikkhus who did not cross over to India sought refuge in the south.² Again when the Theravādins were harassed by king Mahāsena at the instigation of the dwellers of Abhayagiri, headed by Saṅghanitta, the Theravādins left the Mahavihara and went over to Rohana and Malaya and waited there till better times came.³ Thus from the day of Mahinda, Buddhism has flourished and has been preserved there up to the present time in a manner unparalleled in any other part of the island. The firm faith of the inhabitants of Rohana may be gauged from the fact that in the beginning of the last century, after three hundred years of strenuous missionary efforts on the part of three European powers, the Portuguese, the

1. Mv 23.13

2. As may be inferred from the episode concerning Ullasipa therā (SV 446)

3. Nikāya-saṅgraha p 13

Dutch and the English, there were hardly any converts among the Sinhalese in the District of Matara, which covers a considerable portion of the ancient province of Rohana.¹ As Malalasekara observes, this district became the birthplace of of many of Ceylon's most distinguished sons and daughters in all spheres of life and more than half of the best known names in Ceylon literature come from this province.²

Among the many centres of learning in Rohana, the two most outstanding were the Tissamahārāma and the Cittalapabbatavihāra (the modern Situlpav- vehera), both of which were founded by king Mahāvamsa Tissa in the second century B.C.³

Tissamahārāma

Of these two vihāras Tissamahārāma may be considered to have been the more important one in ancient days. It held a position in the southern half of Ceylon which corresponded to that held by the Mahāvihāra in the northern half. The bhikkhus living in the country to the south of the Mahavelli-ganga used to assemble at the Tissamahārāma to spend the rainy season in the same way as those living to the north of the river assembled at the Mahāvihāra. While assembled there the bhikkhus would revise the Texts and Commentaries they had already learned.⁴

1. Information obtained from a document written by in 1807 by Sir T.Maitland, English Governor of the maritime provinces of Ceylon from 1805-1811. - London Public Record Office, C.O.54.Vol 25.

2.P.L.O. 32

3. MV 22.23

4.SumVil II 581

The monastery was a very prosperous one. When the Brahmanatissa famine broke out, we are told that there was grain in the vihāra to ~~eat~~ ~~it~~ last three years. According to the Samachaviniḍāni there were at that time twelve thousand bhikkhus living in Tissamahārāma¹. There was, however, one disadvantage there then, as now, namely, the scarcity of water during a certain period of the year. Thus we find it recorded that a ~~the~~ ~~thera~~ went over to the Cittalāpabbata-vihāra because of this reason.²

Among the theras who lived at Tissamahārāma may be mentioned Mahāsiva of Gaṇantapabbhara. He knew the three Pitakas together with their Commentaries and was the teacher of eighteen groups of monks. He strove hard and became an Arahanṭ by reflecting on the spotless purity of his life after he had obtained the upāsambhā ordination.³ The theras Maliyadeva and Dhammadiṇṇa came to this vihāra to preach the Doctrine. The former ^{preached} ~~delivered~~, on one occasion, the Ghachakka Sutta.⁴ Hearing the wide spread fame of Dhammadiṇṇa the bhikkhus of Tissamahārāma sent him an invitation to come to them and preach the Doctrine. But, it is said that when he arrived at the vihāra, the resident bhikkhus did not treat him in the manner they ought to have had done.⁵ On another occasion he preached the Aparāṇaka Sutta at the same vihāra.⁶

1. EV 445
2. Pap II 91
3. Man I 40-42

4. Pap Sn 1025
5. Pap I 185. Also see Man I 42
6. VI II 392

The Dhammapadatthakathā refers to another incident that took place in the reign of king Dutthagāmaṇi. The reference is to the wife of ~~kaṭṭhaka-attakara~~ ^{kaṭṭhaka-attakara} Lakuntaka-Atimbāra, a minister of this king. She joined the Order of Buddhist nuns and, while listening to a discourse on the Satipatthāna Sutta at the Tissamahārāma vihāra, she attained the First Path.¹

Mahāgama

The ancient city which stood near the place where the ruins of the Tissamahārāma vihāra lie on the left bank of the Māgama-river was known as ~~the~~ Mahāgāma. 'The village at the mouth of the river still bears the name Māgama'.² This city is well known in the history of Ceylon as the birth-place of her greatest monarch, Dutthagāmaṇi. From the Commentaries we learn that the people of Mahāgāma were noted for their piety. When the Dīghabhāṇaka there Abhaya preached the Mahā-Ariyavaṁsa, paṭipadā, the Paṇḍitasūdanī tells us, 'the whole of Mahāgama' (sabbe Mahāgāme) came to ~~hear~~ ^{account} hear him.³

A very touching ^{account} of a poor man named Darubhāṇḍaka Mahātissa, ~~living~~ who lived in Mahāgāma in the time of king Kakavanna Tissa and who with great difficulty procured the means to supply delicious food to the bhikkhus, is given in ~~the~~ ^{the} Manorathapūraṇī. It is ~~said~~ said that with twelve kaḥapanas obtained by hard work during six months in a sugar mill he gave alms to Pindapātiya Tissa there of Ambariyavihāra,. This

-
1. DhA IV 50, 51
 2. Mv tr.p 146 note 5
 3. Pap I 79

thera, too, learning how and why Tissa worked hard to earn that money, increased his efforts and became an Arahant in order that the gift of Tissa may bear ample fruit.¹ We are told that the thera received this gift when he was on his way to worship the cetiya at Mahāgāma. This cetiya is perhaps the Mahānaga-dāgāba which still exists in the ruins of Mahāgāma.²

Ambariya
vihāra.

From this account it appears that Ambariyavihāra was in Rohana and probably near Mahāgāma. Another well known thera who lived in this vihāra was Pīṅgala Buddharakkhita. Several Commentaries narrate an account of a peasant of Uttaravaddhamāna³ who received the sikkhāpadās (the five steps in self-discipline taken by a lay Buddhist) from the thera mentioned above. One day when the peasant went to a forest he was caught in the coils of a monstrous serpent. He had a weapon with him, with which he could have killed the serpent, but, remembering the sikkhāpadās taken, he preferred to let himself be devoured by the reptile. The Commentaries^{tell us} that in this moment of danger the purity of the peasant's heart was so great that the serpent left him and crept into the forest.⁴ The thera, Pīṅgala Buddharakkhita, is also stated to have lived near the village Uttara,⁵ but we are not able to say definitely where this village was.

1. Man II 60-65

2. See MV tr.p 147 note 1

3. Antaravaddhamāna in SA II 150

4. Att 103; SA II 150; Pap I 204

5. Pap Sn 978

Cittalapabbata

Fifteen miles north-east of
Tissamahārāma lie the ruins of the
Cittalapabbata-vihāra.¹ As was mentioned
before, this monastery was built by king Kakavappa Tissa, and
at one time it was one of the two most flourishing viharas
in Rahana, the other being the Tissamahārāma. In the time of
the Brāhmanatissa famine there were in this monastery also
twelve thousand resident bhikkhus.² The Papanāsudani describes
it as an exceedingly crowded (acantasāhiko) place³, and
according to the Visuddhimagga many bhikkhus have become
Arahants in that place.⁴ It was so well known as an abode
of sages that it became unsuitable for quiet meditative quiet
meditation during the day time as people used to assemble in
large numbers to pay their homage to the sages.⁵

Concerning the theras who lived in this vihāra,
too, we have valuable references in the Commentaries. The
famous Mahiyadeva preached the Chachakka Sutta here.⁶ A thera
contemporaneous with Mahiyadeva and known by the name of
Ollasurua of Nidhapennapadhanaghara lived in this monastery
and was for a long time under the false belief that he was
an Arahant.⁷ The thera Visākha, who came from Pāṭaliputta

-
1. sv tr.p 148 note 2
 2. SV 445
 3. Pap II 91
 4. VI I 127
 5. Ibid. I 120
 6. Pap Sn 1024, 1025
 7. SV 489

and entered the Order at the Mahavihara, journeyed towards the south and arrived at Cittalāpabbata. Here he attained Arhantship and spent the rest of his life.¹

Incidents in the lives of several monks belonging to this monastery are mentioned in the Commentaries as illustrations of the development of various ascetic qualities, which will be seen from the following examples: Padhaniya there could bear with the intensest form of bodily pain and yet keep his mind calm and concentrated;² a pindapātika there presented his valuable alms-bowl to assuage the anger of another who hated him;³ two theras purified their minds to such an extent that they obtained the power of clairvoyance and could see objects in the dark;⁴ a therā by the name of Cittagutta possessed such previous training in meditation that the sign of the piṭṭha-kajjapa (yellow device) arose in him when he saw a heap of untreated flowers offered in the monastery;⁵ and another therā who was able to know the exact length of his span of life performed ^{the} extraordinary task of passing away while walking to and fro on the terrace of the vihāra.⁶

We have had occasion earlier to refer to a therā who came from Tissamahārāma to Cittalāpabbata because of the scarcity of water in the former place.⁷ This therā came with

1. VI I 313

2. Pap I 79. Also see Ibid. I 275, SV 264

3. VI I 306

4. Ibid., II 326 634

5. Ibid. I 173

6. Ibid. I 292

7. Pap II 91, 92. Also see Man I 44

a sāmanera who, while clearing a cave for his teacher, recited the Sanyuttanikāya and practised the teisakagigā tejo-kasina (fire-device) meditation. It is said that before long the samanera became an Arahant and , when he passed away, a cetiya was built enshrining his relics. This cetiya was known as Tissattheracetiya and was extant when the Commentary on the Majjhimanikāya was compiled.¹ The Manorathapurani bears also testimony to the amazing devotion of a lay woman who came to the Cittalapabbata vihāra to listen to a preaching of the Dhamma.²

Side by side with people of high spiritual attainments, we find also in the same place those of a different nature. We are told that once a resident bhikkhu of this vihāra drew a circle at the entrance of the dining hall, thus cunningly suggesting to the attendants of the monastery that the monks should receive cakes of that size. Such an irregular act, the Samantapāsādikā says, was never heard of at Cittalapabbata and all the bhikkhus remonstrated against it.³ Another amusing incident account of a dull-witted monk of this vihāra, who entered the Order in his old age and acted as an Upatthāra (attendant) of an Arahant is recorded in more than one Commentary.⁴ Further, mention is made of a young bhikkhuni of

1. Pap II 91, 92. Also see Man I 44

2. Man II 250

3. Snp III 681

4. Att 350; Pap I 22; GuHIA 54; SA II 252

died
Cittalapabbata, who ~~died~~ as a result of passion.¹ Instances of this nature are, however, seldom found in connection with this monastery and form the exception and not the rule.

Kotapabbata
vihāra

A monastery not far from Cittalapabbata was the Kotapabbata-vihāra. The Visuddhimagga mentions a therā known as Tissa belonging to this vihāra and who knew exactly the end of his span of life.² A sāmaṇera of the same vihāra is mentioned in the Mahāvamsa as having fixed three slabs of stone as steps to the courtyard of the Akāsa-cetiya, the ruins of which are to be seen today in the neighbourhood of the Cittalapabbata monastery.³

Kataragana

About ten miles to the north of Tissamahārāma was the Kataragana-mahāvihāra (now Kataragana)⁴. It is about the same distance, but in a different direction, from Cittalapabbata. A sapling grown from the seeds of the sacred Bodhi Tree was caused to be planted there by Devānampiyatissa.⁵ In this place there is a dagaba known now as the Kirivahera, which is traditionally said to have been founded by Mahanaga. 'On some of the bricks fallen down from the dome

1. EV 498; Sum Vil III 994

2. VI I 292; Sug.Paṇ.Com. in J.F.T.S. 1914 p 186

3. EV tr. p 148 note 4 . A Kotipabbatamahāvihāra is

4. mentioned in DhA IV 50. Perhaps this is the same as the one under our present discussion. A therā Anula by name, lived there in the time of Duttha-

4. Kataragana in Snp I 100 (Snp.I.

5. EV tr.p 132 note 1

6. Snp I 100.

there are Brāhmī letters of about the first century B.C., inscribed as masons' marks. And, one of the inscriptions at the place records its ~~an~~ enlargement in the first or second century A.D. Therefore, this thūpa may well be ~~an~~ ascribed to a very early date, though we may not accept the tradition in its entirety.¹ In one of the inscriptions found here mention is made of a therā named Nāda and of a monastery called Ahujuka.²

V
Gāṇḍavāla
Mahāvihāra.

In the vicinity of both Cittalapabbata and Kājaragana there was another monastery known as the Gāṇḍavāla Mahāvihāra.

A hunter by the name of Milakkha Tissa (Tissa, the Savage) entered the Order under the guidance of Cūḍapāṇḍapatika Tissa of this vihāra. After he became a monk Milakkha Tissa was very zealous and attended diligently to the duties at Cittalapabbata, Gāṇḍavāla and Kājaragana on successive days. Once he heard the Arunavatiya Sutta from a samanera at Pācīnapabbata and, reflecting on that Sutta, he became an Anāgāmi. Later he attained Arāhantship.³ The Gāṇḍavāla vihāra is also mentioned as one of the places where Mahiyadeva therā preached the Chachakka Sutta.⁴

1. Ep Zey. III 214

2. Ibid p 215

3. Man I 35 foll.; Pj II 236; SA I 332; II 273.

According to SA II 274 he became an Anāgāmi by hearing a verse in the Dhammapada and not the ~~and not the~~ Arunavatiya Sutta (S I 156 foll.)

4. Pap Sh 1024

Talaṅgara
vihāra

The Talaṅgara¹ vihāra, too, was situated in the neighbourhood of the locality under our discussion at present. This vihāra is mentioned in the Aṭṭhakathās as the abode of Dhammadinna there about whom we have already made mention several times.²

Dighavāpi

In the northern part of the province of Rohana lies the district of Dighavāpi. A cetiya and a monastery were who, built there by King Saddhātissa, during the reign of his elder brother Dutthagāmaṇi, was in that district for many years busily engaged in the promotion of agriculture.³ The cetiya was considered to be a sacred one as there prevailed the belief that the spot on which the cetiya stood was visited by the Buddha.⁴ How a sāmaṇera who was engaged in whitewashing the cetiya slipped down but was miraculously saved from death is described in the Sāratthappakāsinī.⁵ Dighavāpi is also mentioned as another place where Mahiyadeva preached the Chachakka Sutta.⁶ On one occasion it was announced that a Mahājātakabhanaka there would preach at Dighavāpi the Mahāvessantara Jātaka, and we are told that a sāmaṇera went there from Tissamahārāma covering on foot the long distance of nine yojanas.⁷

1. Also called Talaṅgaratissapabbata (Pap I 184).

2. SV 389, 489; Man I 42; Vī II 392, 634; Pap I 184.

3. See MV 24.58; 32.2

4. Snp I 89

5. SA I 341

6. Pap Sn 1024

7. Man II 249

There are a few other ~~places~~ monasteries belonging to Rohana but which I am unable to locate in relation to other known localities. They are:

1. Eherapasāna vihāra. The Manerathapurani describes how certain young bhikkhus of this vihāra deceived an ignorant ^{man} and made him carry a huge load of grass.¹

2. Cūlanāgalena. A large number of bhikkhus is said to have attained Arhantship while meditating in this place.² There was ~~an~~ a monastery by the name of Cūlanāgapabbata vihāra.³ It is possible that Cūlanāgalena was a cave or a group of caves at the Cūlanāga mountain (pabbata).

3. Kālavallinapāpa - the place of residence of Mahānāga there who lived in the time of Dutthagamani. It appears as if it was about six hours' journey by foot from Uttasālagāma, the present Buttala.⁴

4. Kuṭṭimbiya vihāra. According to the ~~an~~ Manerathapurani a young bhikkhu in this monastery was well known for his contentment.⁵

5. Nāgamahavihāra. Probably this was the vihāra of the same name built by King Mahānāga, a younger brother of Devānampiyatissa.⁶

1. Man II 347

2. Vi I 127

3. Mv 34.90 . Also see Mv tr.p 245 note 1

4. Att 398

5. Man II 30

6. Sv 407; Mv 22.9

6. Tulādhārapabbata vihāra. This was a famous centre of learning in Rohapa in the first century A.D. Tipitaka Ollabhaya was sent from Anurādhapura to study the Keariyavada under Mahādharmarakkhita there who lived in this monastery.¹

7. Uccatalakka.² The thera Mahanāga³ lived here in the first century B.C. Probably this place was not far from Talangara (or Talakka) and from Tissamaharama.⁴

We have so far dealt with places which could be either identified with those known at the present day or located with some degree of certainty in relation to them. There is, however, a considerable number of references in the Commentaries which I am unable to include in the one group or the other. Perhaps with the further discovery of inscriptions and the publication of hitherto unpublished Sinhalese texts it may become possible to locate many of them. The places in question are as follows:

1. Alindaka. Phussaḍeva thera, of whom we had occasion to mention in an earlier chapter, lived in the place known as Alindaka.⁵

¹
2. Ardyaketi. A thera by the name of Mahadatta lived

1. VI I 96

2. Uccavalika in VI II 634

3. SV 489

4. SV 489

5. SA Sn III 154; PJ II 55; SV 352; ApA 120

here. His virtues were so great that, it is said, even hostile deities could not terrify him.¹

3. Antarasamudda. The Samantapāsādikā refers to a certain event that followed the visit of a bhikkhu from the monastery at An from the Antarasamudda-vihāra to Getiyagiri. This took place during the reign of king Bhatiya.²

4. Devaputtamahāratta. The thera Pindapātika Tissa of Devaputtamahāratta is mentioned as a thera who knew exactly the end of his span of life.³

5. Dampallavāpiggama. A thera of this village was noted for his ability to bear with insults flung upon him.⁴

6. Galambatittha-vihāra. Fifty bhikkhus who spent the rainy season in this monastery decided among themselves not to speak to each other until they became Arahants. With this firm resolve in mind they strove diligently and fulfilled their ambition.⁵

7. Gaggaruvaliya-aṅgama. Pitsamāla, who came from India and entered the Order at the Mahāvihāra, did his meditation here and finally became an Arahant.⁶

8. Girivihāra. According to the Manorathapūraṇī the thera Cullapindapātīya Tissa of Girivihāra saved a Tamil fisherman

1. Pap I 160

2. Sup II 306, 307

3. V1 I 292

4. Pug. Pañ. Com. in J.P.T.S. 1914 p 184

5. EV 353; Pj II 57; ApA 121

6. Pap I 234

of the village Madhu-angana from being reborn after death in an unhappy state.¹ In the same vihāra there lived also a pupil of Tipitaka Cullasumana there² who flourished in the first century A.D.

9. Girikapāḍavihāra - mentioned in the Visuddhimagga³ and the Atthasālinī⁴. Vattakalaka was a village in the neighbourhood of this monastery.⁵

10. Hatthikucchi vihāra - described as a well-known (*loka samvata*) monastery. When a bhikkhu resided here, the people came to pay their reverence to him, taking him to be an Arahant.⁶ In the Visuddhimagga a Hatthikucchi-pabbhara⁷ is mentioned along with Mahindaguhā.⁸ Perhaps this cave was also a part of the same vihāra. An inscription at Mihintale belonging to the eleventh century A.D. has a reference to an *Āt-vehera* [*Āt Hatthi-vihāra*]. This evidence combined with the fact that Hatthikucchipabbhāra is mentioned along with Mahindaguhā which is at Mihintale, makes it probable that there is some close geographical connection between the two.

11. Kāhala. An opinion of the theras Summa of Kāhala is mentioned with those of some others as a *therasallāpa* (discussion of the theras).⁹

1. Man II 215

2. L. Sum VII II 514

3. Vī I 143

4. Att 116

5. Ibid 116

6. Vī I 120

7. Pabbhara = ~~Sum~~ A cave in a mountain

8. Vī I 110

9. Sum VII III 882

12. Kanikaravāḷika-saṇḍa vihāra . The thera Saketa Tissa went ~~saṇḍa-vihāra~~ to this vihāra to obtain a quiet time for meditation. ¹

13. Karundakola - mentioned as the place of residence of a thera by the name of Mahadeva. ²

14. Kassakalena. A thera called Mahamitta lived in the name Kassakalena. Many of the Commentaries have preserved an account of a poor woman who provided this thera with dainty food, while she was content with mere gruel of coarse vegetable and rice. The thera, it is said, came to know of this fact and acted in such a way as to bring ample reward to the faithful upasika. ³

15. Khandacala-vihāra. There was a ~~nadhāna-hara~~ (^{name of} meditation - house) by the [^] Kanikara attached to ~~this~~ this vihāra. ⁴

16. Korundaka-vihāra. A young bhikkhu went from here to Rohana to receive his education. The detachment of this bhikkhu from all family ties is highly praised in the Visuddhimagga. ⁵

17. Kurundaka. A thera, Phussaṇṇitta by name, is mentioned as a resident of Kurundaka. ⁶ If Codrington's identification of Kurunda tank with the present Giants' Tank is correct, ⁷ this vihāra was probably situated near Manaar. ⁸

1. Pap II 140; Man I 77

2. Man Sn 611

3. SV 279; Man II 59; Pap I 294; SA Sn III 136

4. Pap I 78

5. V1 I 91

6. Man I 53, 59

7. A Short History of Ceylon p 35

8. Geiger, Cūlavamsa translation Vol I p 66
note 6.

18. Kupuvena-vihāra. The Papañcasūdanī gives an account of a therā who went with a sāmapera to worship cetiya in different places. When they arrived at Kupuvena-vihāra, the sāmapera went out to ^{obtain} ~~prepare~~ his meals and there having seen a weaver's daughter, a girl ^{exceedingly} ~~extremely~~ beautiful and in the prime of youth, fell in love with her and fell, too, from the high spiritual development which he had acquired. ~~Consequently~~ Consequently he gave up the monk's life and, the account proceeds, spent his days under very unsatisfactory conditions.¹

19. Kutāli-vihāra - one of the places where Mahiyadeva therā preached the Chachakka Sutta.²

20. Lokantara-vihāra. Datta, a young bhikkhu of Lokantara-vihāra, is said to have developed the ^śśānta-bhāvanā (white-device) meditation as a result of the mental calm he obtained by cleaning the compound of a cetiya.³ A Lokandara is mentioned as a place visited by Mahiyadeva.⁴ If these two names are identical, there is reason to suppose that the monastery was in Rohana as the position of Lokandara in a list of vihāras given in the Papañcasūdanī⁴ is between Dīghavāpi and Gāmeppavala, both of which, we have ~~spk~~ already seen, were in that district.

21. Mahākarañjiya-vihāra. The therā Mahatissa of this monastery is said to have had the power of knowing beforehand

1. Pap Sn 700, 701

2. Ibid. 1024

3. Snp Sn II 377

4. Pap Sn 1024

the exact moment of his passing away.¹

22. *Miluppalavāpi-vihāra* . According to the *Papañcasūdanī* an Arahant *thera* of this *vihāra* was greatly misunderstood by one of his co-residents. Out of compassion for the latter the *thera* made him understand the purity of his life.²

23. *Nagapabbata-vihāra* - mentioned in connection with a *thera* called *Padhaniya Tissa*.³

24. *Pācaggalāna* . Another instance of a young *bhikkhu* who lost the powers of his spiritual attainment is seen in the case of *Tissa* of *Pācaggalāna*. He was enticed by the song of a smith's daughter in *Sākā* *Virijjā* and consequently left the Order to marry her.⁴

25. *Piyāṅgulīpa* (*Panicum Island*). 'The monks living there enjoyed a reputation for particular holiness,'⁵ and the *Mahāvamsa* speaks very highly of them.⁶ This Chronicle and the Commentaries mention ~~xxx~~ several miraculous incidents said to have happened in connection with the *theras* of *Piyāṅgulīpa* . The *thera Mahanaga*, according to the *Visuddhimagga*, was unseated by a fire that burned to ashes a hall in which he was sitting in meditation;⁷ and according to the *Sumanāgalavilāsini*, *Sakka*, the chief of the gods, came personally to

1. VI I 992.

2. *Pap* II 385

3. VI I 127

4. *Pap* II 144; *ApA* 128; *Pj* II 70; *CuNIA* 78

5. *Mv* tr. p 166 note 4

6. *Mv* 24.25; 25.104; 32.52

7. VI II 706

invite the monks of Piyadigulpa in connection with their spending of the vassa season.¹

26. Potaliya-vihāra. A therā Dattābhaya by name, lived here. He was the elder brother of Catunīkayika Tissa therā of Kelita-vihāra.² The Atthasalini quotes the name of a Dattābhaya as therā as an example of those people who have strong likes and dislikes, but are 'intelligent and keen as adamant in wit'.³ It is, however, not possible to say whether these two names referred to the same person.

27. Sonagiri Mountain. At the foot of this mountain there was a monastery known as the Pañcālanahavihāra.⁴ The therā Sopa of this monastery caused his father, a man who had spent all his life up to this time as a hunter, to join the Order in spite of the latter's unwillingness to do so. We are told that the therā was, at last, successful in turning his father's mind away from sinful acts and thus paving the way for him to have a peaceful death.⁵

28. Sudhāmaṇḍaka. A young bhikkhu of Sudhāmaṇḍaka-vihāra is mentioned as still another monk who fell from his higher life as a result of listening to a woman's voice.⁶

29. Vedhatalanagara-vihāra. The Sāratthappakāsinī gives an account of two brothers Mahānāga and Cūlanāga of the village Vedhatalanagara (gama), who joined the Order and lived at

1. Itti VII II 648

2. Man II 173

3. Att 268. The Expositor II 356

4. The name of this vihāra is given as Pippalivihāra in SV 439 and as Paṇḍalivihāra in Pap Sn 887.

5. SV 439; Man II 17; Pap Sn 887

6. Man I 26

Cittalapabbata for thirty years. After they became Arahants they returned to Vadhatalanagara to pay a visit to their mother.¹ From this account it appears ^{that} as this village was in Rohana .

30. Vajagavagiri-vihāra. The Papancaasūdanī has preserved for us the description of the daily routine of Kāladēva, a therā who lived in Vajagirinagara-vihāra. During the vasa season he performed the duty of striking the gong in the monastery. He was so accustomed to do this at the proper time that it was not necessary for him to set the tube of the watch-machine (Ma ca yāvanta-gālikam payojetī), whereas others were in the habit of setting it. At the end of the first watch of the night he would get up and strike the gong. He was so accurate in doing this that simultaneously ⁿ with his striking the gong, the watch-machine, too, would begin to strike (yāvantaṃ paṭṭati). In the morning after returning from his begging round he would keep the bowl in the dining hall and go for quiet meditation to the place where the bhikkhus spent the day-time (divāvihāraṭṭhānaṃ). When it was time for meal~~time~~ the bhikkhus would look at the time-post (kālatthabha - perhaps a pillar on which a sun-dial was fixed) and send some bhikkhu to fetch Kāladēva . The latter was so clever in sensing the time that he always met the bhikkhu on his way.² This account is both interesting and useful in that it shows us that at least fifteen centuries ago there were in use in Ceylon skilful contrivances for the measurement of time. The yāva-yanti was evidently a kind of alarm-clock.

1. SA II 166

2. Pap I 122,123.

CHAPTER VIII

The Buddhist Life.

It is clear from what was discussed in the preceding chapters - and especially in the last one - that Buddhism had, by the time the Commentaries were written, spread throughout the length and breadth of the country. It was this one faith that prevailed from Dīghavāpi in the east to Kalyāṇi in the west, from Māgadīpa in the north to Mahāgāma in the south; and there is not the least doubt that it had its influence in every department of the life of the Sinhalese nation. The laymen - comprising the kings, the nobility and the common folk - considered it their bounden duty to help the monks by bestowing on them food, clothes and other requisites, and the monks in turn considered it their duty to instruct and enlighten the laity in matters spiritual pertaining to this life and to the hereafter. In this chapter we shall, therefore, discuss, in general outline, how the Buddhist faith affected the everyday life of the inhabitants of Ceylon. Our observations on the subject may be brought roughly under three broad headings: viz., (1) the life of the bhikkhu, (2) the life of the layman and (3) the relationship between the bhikkhu and the layman.

1. The Life of the Bhikkhu.

We have seen how shortly after the advent of Mahinda, people, both men and women, left the home-life in large numbers to don the yellow robe. Perhaps, as was pointed out in an earlier chapter, Buddhism was sufficiently well known in Ceylon and the soil was as already prepared for Mahinda to sow the seed of monasticism. This, in my opinion, was the reason why men and women, both great and small, rich and poor alike, entered the monastic life by the hundreds and hundreds. Before long the Buddhist Order became a highly respected and influential organization [^]the island. The causes that led to this state of affairs need not be repeated here. The Commentaries are full of statements which show how monasticism spread. Buddhaghosa remarks that there were ~~thūpas~~ ^{thūpas} to be erected enshrining the ashes of ordinary (puthujāna) bhikkhus, the island of Ceylon would not have sufficient room for them.¹ At one time, it is said, there was not a bhikkhu in Ceylon who had not attained to the Paths of Salvation.² In Anurādhapura alone, a mahāthera is made to say, more than bhikkhus attained Arhantship than there were grains of sand in the compound of the Mahāceṭiya.³ According to another Commentary there was no seat in the resting-houses of the villages of Ceylon, but that

1. Man Sn 607

2. SV 431, 432

3. BA Sn III 151

a bhikkhu had sat on it and attained Arhantship there.¹ The country was so full of monasteries that there was one long peal of bells from Mahānāgā to Līchhikālī, from Kalyāṇī to Māgadīpa;² and many were the vihāras such as the Abhayagiri, the Cetiyapabbata and the Cittalāpabbata, each of which had twelve thousand bhikkhus.³ These statements are not to be taken literally. Due allowance should be made for the use of figurative language. But when all such allowance is made, we are still left with the picture of a Ceylon dotted with monasteries and with the yellow robe shining everywhere.

With the growing numbers of the bhikkhus and in the absence of one supreme head it would have been in the nature of things for the organisation to become unwieldy and for the bhikkhus to grow lax in their discipline. Laxity on the part of certain individuals there indeed was, but, as far as we can see from the Commentaries, the sangha on the whole preserved a high degree of purity. It is possible for the objection to be raised with regard to this point that the Commentaries were the work of bhikkhus and hence facts unfavourable to them might have been purposely left out. To those who read the Commentaries carefully it becomes evident that this charge of possible conscious omission is not

1. Pap I 257. The same statement is made in ApA II 9, Sum VII I 188 and Pj II 53

2. SA II 230. I am unable to locate the first two places.

3. Sum VII II 478

true, for the aim of the commentators was not to give a history of the sangha but to elucidate points of difficulty in the Doctrine. Local illustrations were brought forward now and then to drive the explanations home in to the pupils, and in these were mentioned virtues as well as weaknesses of several Ceylonese monks and laymen. ¹

We are therefore led to think assign the long sustained purity of the sangha to the faith that the monks had in the Master as well as in his teachings. Buddhaghosa explains several methods used by the bhikkhus to check impure thoughts and to lead a pure life. One of the methods was for a bhikkhu to advise himself thus: "By birth you are not one of a low order. You are descended from the unbroken line of Mahāsammāsita and born in the dynasty of king Okkaka. You are a grandson of the great king ⁿ Siddhodaka, and you are a younger brother of Rahulabhadra. It ill becomes one such as you, a son of the Jina (Conqueror i.e., the Buddha) to live in idleness." ¹ This passage shows clearly the close relationship that the bhikkhus were taught to have towards the Buddha.

The Commentaries have many episodes which depict the intensity of such faith - not blind faith that made one believe without investigation all that came under the name of the Doctrine, but that faith which was living, which revealed the true meaning of the teachings, which enthused one to seek

that truth and live the life. A young bhikkhu of Tissanaharāma, it is said, came the long distance of nine yojanas to Dīghavapi to hear the preaching of a Mahājātakabhāṇaka there.¹ A bhikkhu at Gavaravala-aṅgapa endured for one full night a painful scorpion-bite lest by his moving from the place he should disturb others listening to the Doctrine.² Another there, Mahāphussadeva of Alindaṇḍa, shed tears and wept because, in spite of his attempts, he could not become an Arahanṭ during the time limit he fixed for himself.³ The there Cittagutta lived in the cave Karapaṇḍa for over sixty years, but so restrained was he in the use of his five senses that during the whole of that time he did not look at the beautiful paintings on the walls of the cave.⁴ A young bhikkhu of Korapaṇḍa vihāra, on his return from Rohapa whither he had gone to receive his education, did not make himself known to his parents though he visited them daily for three months as he did not wish to receive any special treatment from them.⁵ There⁶ are only a few of many such examples.

We are also told of ~~many~~^{many} bhikkhus who subjected themselves to rigorous discipline in order to attain complete emancipation from the defilements of the heart. They observed rigorous practices such as the gatacāgāgata⁶ vatta⁵ and also

1. Man II 249

2. Ibid. II 248

3. Pap II 369

4. V I 38

5. Ibid. I 91

6. Lit., 'the observance of one who has gone and returned.'

the ascetic practices known as the dhutaṅgas.¹ The sata-
paccāsatavatta is such that if an impure thought arises in a
bhikkhu while he is walking, he strives to get control over it
by remaining in the posture of standing, or, if necessary, of
sitting down at the same place; and if he is unable to destroy
it then and there, he puts off his journey and returns to his
abode. The thera Mahāphussa-deva practised this for nineteen
years before he became an Arhant.² For seven years Mahānāga
of Kālavallimāṇḍapa used only the two postures of standing and
walking and then for a period of another sixteen years practised
the satapaccāsatavatta.³ The thera Sasaṇḍika Mahābhaddara, it is
said, lived meditating in a burial ground for sixty years.⁴
Another thera at Cetiyaṇḍabbata observed the dhutaṅga-dhutaṅga⁵
for fifty years.⁶

Not only were these bhikkhus rigorous in discipline
there were also those well versed in the canonical literature
literature. It is not rarely that we find read about monks who
could recite from memory long Texts such as the Majjhima and
the Saṃyutta Nikāyas from beginning to end without making any
mistake. Majjhimaṇḍānaka Rava thera, we are told, knew the
Majjhimaṇḍānaka so well that he could recite ^{it} from memory though
he was out of touch with it for twenty years.⁷ In a similar

1. For details of these practices see VI ch. 3.

2. Pap I 257, Sum VII I 189, Apā 120, SV 352.

3. Pj II 56

(Pj II 55, 56

4. Ek 2 68 Man I 77

5. For details see VI I 69

6. Pap II 140, Man I 77. These are but a few of
a large number of similar references in
the Commentaries.

7. VI I 95

manner than^h there Nāga of Karaliyagiri could recite the Dhatupāṭha after an interval of eighteen years.¹ While clearing a cave for the use of his teacher, the sāmaṇera Tissa recited the whole of the Saṃyuttanikāya.² It was this proficiency in their learning that enabled the bhikkhus to hand down the Texts by word of mouth until they were committed to writing in the first century B.C. The traditional practice of a pupil remaining with his teacher as long as the latter lived, no doubt, helped in a great measure to obtain a high degree of proficiency.³ Unfortunately we are not in a position to know any details of the methods of teaching in those days. There is one passage - repeated many times - in the Commentaries which throws some light on the manner in which instruction was imparted. The passage in question mentions a class held in the courtyard of the Mahācetiya. It consisted of young bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs, and the bhikkhunīs were seated behind the bhikkhus, the distance separating them being ~~less~~ less than an arm's length.⁴ Though the customary method of learning was by listening to one's teachers, each bhikkhu carried with him in his knapsack a small hand-book (muttipotṭhaka) in which were written the virtues of the Buddha and the Dhamma. The chief purpose of this was to read it whenever an undesirable thought arose in the mind of the bhikkhu.⁵

1. Vī I 96

2. Pap II 91

3. See Snp I 264

4. Pap I 264, II 145; SA Sn III 159, Man I 27

5. Pap II 91

The literary qualifications that teachers of various grades should possess are given in the *Samantapāsādikā*¹, and we have already dealt with these in the chapter on the *Bhāṣakas*.

We have also in the Commentaries some information with regard to the every-day life of the bhikkhus. It was the duty of the resident bhikkhus of a vihara to keep it tidy and in good condition. 'The courtyards of the cetiya and the Bodhi Tree are well cleansed. The brooms are properly placed. Water for the use (of the bhikkhus) is well kept.' Such is the description of a monastery in which the residents live in harmony and peace.² Sometimes even the white-washing (*sutthā-kamma*) of the cetiyas was done by the bhikkhus.³ There were also bhikkhus who were appointed to look after the repairs of the community building. They were called the *San bhāhārahārakā* (bearers of the burden of the community).⁴ The personal property of a bhikkhu, as shown in the Commentaries, was not much. Besides the three robes and the alms-bowl, the following were also included in it.

1. *Suttapittakā* (Hand-book), in which as mentioned before, the virtues of the Buddha and the Dhamma were written.

1. *Sap Sn* II 34, 35
 2. *Pj* II 57
 3. *Pap* II 403
 4. *Vi* I 94

- | | | |
|------------------------|------|-------------------------------|
| 2. <u>Arani</u> | etc. | Apparatus for producing fire. |
| 3. <u>Sinatika</u> | | Razor-case . |
| 4. <u>Arakantaka</u> | | Thimble (?). |
| 5. <u>Pinphalaka</u> | | Pair of scissors. |
| 6. <u>Nakhachedana</u> | | Nail-clipper. |
| 7. <u>Silei</u> | | Needle. |

All these articles were carried by a bhikkhu in his knapsack (khana thavikā).¹

We have discussed at the end of the last chapter the daily routine of the bhikkhus at the Vajagaregiri monastery as described in the Paṇḍitasiddhāntī. Though we do not have any definite evidence to prove it, it is quite likely that bhikkhus of other vihāras, too, had a somewhat similar time-table.

Much emphasis is laid on the importance of attending on the sick in a monastery. It was so important that Buddhaghosa says that even in the case of a bhikkhu devoted to meditation, he should first look after the sick, if there are any in the monastery. If a teacher is seriously ill, a pupil bhikkhu should attend on him even as long as the former lives.²

2. The Life of the Layman.

We now come to the life of the layman. Much of what has to be said in the present discussion has been dealt with in earlier chapters by way of incidental references here and there. We shall now attempt to present some of them

1. Pap II 91
2. Vi I 94

in a connected form.

One who reads the early history of Ceylon cannot but be struck by the large number of Sinhalese kings whose lives were embodiments of faith and ~~g~~ piety. Dutthagamani, Saddhātissa, Bhātiya and Saṅghabodhi may be cited as examples. The religious life of the common folk, too, is not less worthy of notice as will be seen from the following. Tissa, a lay follower of the Buddha, disobeyed king Saddhātissa, who with the intention of testing the former's faith ordered him to kill a fowl. The king threatened Tissa with punishment by death for disobeying the order, but Tissa was not to be moved by such threats.¹ The peasant of Uttaravaddhamāna, who took the five precepts at the feet of Piṅgala Buddhārakkhita, was ready to allow the python that caught him in ^{its} coils to swallow him rather than kill the dreadful serpent.² Cakkapa, another faithful observer of the precepts, did not destroy the life of a hare even to save that of his own mother.³

Protection of the life of every sentient being, which is a basic ethical principle in Buddhism, was practised through the length and breadth of the land on more than one occasion under the influence of the early Sinhalese monarchs. In the time of king Bhātiya eating beef was an offence punishable with fine.⁴ Anapāgamaṇi made the whole country vegetarian

1. SA Sn III 49

2. Pap I 204, Att 103, SA II 150

3. Pap I 203, Att 103, SA II 150

4. SV 440

by issuing a royal decree forbidding the killing of any kind of living being.¹ Voharaka Tissa instituted a law making corporal punishment illegal.²

There is good reason to suppose that Buddhism had also a strong influence in minimising the abuses of the caste-system. A comparison of the system as it exists today in India and in Ceylon bears testimony to this fact. Untouchability as it is found in some parts of the sub-continent is unknown among the Sinhalese inhabitants of Ceylon. The system was, however, not altogether done away with. We find mention made of places named after people belonging to different grades of society, e.g., Kevattavithi (Fishermen's Street) in Anurādhapura³ and Vessagirivihāra⁴ (the monastery so called because 500 young men belonging to the veśsa or the merchant caste entered the Order and dwelt there). Perhaps the system was already too deeply rooted in the people when they accepted the faith or perhaps it survived because of economical reasons.

Some form of slavery, too, seems to have existed in ancient Ceylon. The *Samantapāsādikā* has recorded an account of a bhikkhu who was the son of a ~~bhikkhu~~ slave woman in Anurādhapura. She eloped with a man and having fled from Anurādhapura lived with her husband in Rohana. There she gave birth to a son, who in due course entered the Order

1. *Mv* 35.6 *fall*.

2. *Ibid.* 36.28

3. *Pap Sn* 713

4. *Mv* 20.15

and obtained the higher ordination. Later he discovered that he was the son of a slave woman and, as it was against the Vinaya rules for a slave to enter the Order unless he had received permission from his master,¹ he went to Amarābhaya and obtained the necessary permission.² This account shows that to the master belonged not only the slaves but their offspring as well. Unfortunately we do not have sufficient light on the problem of slavery in ancient Ceylon to find out how far Buddhism helped to destroy its evils and abuses.

Buddhism entered so intimately into the activities of everyday life that we find even songs sung by the ordinary folk to be pregnant with deep religious sentiment. Thus, it is said, sixty bhikkhus attained Arahantship by hearing a Sinhalese song sung by a girl who was keeping watch over a rice field.³ We are also told that the Ceylonese people were in the habit of saying 'Namo Buddhānaṃ' (Salutations to the Buddhas) when they coughed or sneezed.⁴ This was very likely to a belief that something auspicious should be said after either of these acts, especially after that of sneezing.⁵

1. Oldenberg : Vinaya Pitaka, Vol I p 76

2. Snp Sn II 178

3. Pj II (2) 397, SA I 273

4. Sum VII III 875

5. Such a belief exists in most Christian and other countries, too, at the present day. According to the Encyclopædia Britannica "A venerable and widespread belief survives in the custom of saying 'God bless you' when a person sneezes. The Hindus say 'live' to which the answer is 'with you' is given (E.B. Taylor, Primitive Culture, I, 101). A sneeze was considered a sign or omen from the gods by the Greeks and Romans; it was one of the many common everyday occurrences which it is

3. The Relationship between the Bhikkhu and the Layman.

(a) Attitude of the layman to the bhikkhu: From the king down to the poorest man each one tried to the best of his ability to perform the duty of helping to maintain the sasana. We have already had occasion many times to refer to the piety of the ordinary poor peasant and how he strenuously sought to help the monk who led a righteous life. Suffice it to repeat that even poor men and women who could only eke out a hand to mouth existence tried all possible means to keep the bhikkhus in comfort.¹ Even in times of famine when the people lived on leaves they did not fail to share their scanty provisions with the bhikkhus.²

(b) Attitude of the bhikkhu to the layman. The monk who was thus looked after did not fail to perform his duty by the lay supporter. His duty consisted predominantly in teaching the people as to the way of right living. It is not easy to overestimate the importance of the part played by the bhikkhu in bringing about that in Ceylon that high standard of culture which she enjoyed for a period whose parallel in duration is not to be found in many other countries in the world.

coming at an important moment could be interpreted as presaging the future. There are many allusions to it in classical literature..... There are references to it in Rabbinical literature, and it has been found in Otaheite, Florida and the Tonga Islands. (BH Enc. Bit. Vol.25 Article on 'Sneezing').

1. Man II 59 foll.

2. SV 447

In addition to the informal elucidation of the teachings which, no doubt, the bhikkhus imparted to the laymen whenever the latter desired it, there was also an organized and more formal method of preaching. The earliest mention of this organization goes back to the time of king Dutthagāmaṇi. 'He instituted "the preaching of religious discourses to be kept up in the vihāras in various parts of Lanka, supporting the ministers of religion who were gifted with the power of preaching preaching."'¹ Later kings, too, extended their liberality to promote the same cause. King Buddhadāsa went to the extent of fixing salaries for the preachers in different places.² The preachings usually lasted a whole night.³ It was customary for a spacious hall to be built in a village for conducting such preaching. People then assembled at this building and listened to the discourses.⁴ The procedure adopted at a dhamma-ḍeṣanā (preaching of the Doctrine) is given in the Manorathapāṭraṇi. The divakathikathera (the thera who preached during the day-time) finishes his discourse in the evening. Then comes the turn of the paṭaḥḥanaka (reciter of the words). It is difficult to say what the exact function of the paṭaḥḥanaka was. Perhaps he recited word by word the scriptural passage which was to be expounded next. Finally comes the chief preacher for the night,

1. P.L.G. 38

2. -v 37.149

3. EV 348; Paṭ II 294

4. Paṭ II 294 SV 348

who explains the Doctrine in detail.¹ In some places the dhamma-desana was held at regular intervals, especially during the vassa season.² The announcement of a preaching was sometimes made by beat of drum.³

Though there is no direct evidence to prove that during the period under our discussion the village monastery was also the village school, there is to be seen a tendency towards the task of the teacher falling upon the bhikkhu. The monks were naturally more educated than the lay people, and the latter used to approach the bhikkhus to obtain even such information as the dates of the month.⁴ In later times the education of the Sinhalese children and even of the adults became a sacred duty of the monk. How far the bhikkhus helped the lay folk in the art of writing we are unable to say. If the practice adopted by Dutthagamani of recording his meritorious deeds⁵ was a general one, we shall not be wrong in assuming that the ancient Sinhalese possessed a very satisfactory and complete system of education.

The pious or learned bhikkhu was regarded with very high esteem. There is an instance of a thera being appointed by the king to decide cases that arose not only among the clergy but among the laity as well.⁶ The history of Ceylon is, however,

1. Man II 249

2. Ibid., II 248

3. V I 96

4. Pj II 56, V I 187, Sum VII I 190

5. Man II 214, Mv 32.25

6. Snp II 307

not without instances when this influence possessed by the sangha was directed towards channels which cannot be very well regarded as proper to the monk-life. A bhikkhu who has left the entanglements of the world is not expected to take part in politics, especially in political issues where a slight mis-judgment may involve the destruction of life. When Saddhatissa died, his younger son, Thūlathana, was elected king in preference to Lafjatissa the lawful heir. The ministers did this on the strength of the support of the bhikkhus. But this interference of the bhikkhus brought destruction on Thūlathana and much worry to the bhikkhus themselves, for hardly had six weeks elapsed when Lafjatissa seized the government by overpowering his brother and for a long time after that he continued to harass the bhikkhus.¹ A few years later it was as a direct result of the interference of a certain thera that Vattagāmi received the support of his angered ministers to fight the Tamils.² No doubt the unity thus brought about was of great moment in the struggle to regain the lost freedom of the country, but at the same time it cannot be forgotten that it caused the death of many a Tamil too. Again, in the time of king Kanirajānu Tissa we hear of sixty bhikkhus charged of high treason.³ The adventures of the bhikkhus into the realm of politics were occasional and few and there is no

1. Mv 33.17 foll.
 2. Ibid. 33.74
 3. Ibid. 35.10,11

reason to suppose that these affected in any considerable degree the detached and quiet life of the monk in general.

A few words remain to be said on the more intimate social relations between the bhikkhu and the layman.

Buddhaghosa explains^a in his *Visuddhimagga* - and there is little doubt that he based his ex statements on the accepted views as were found in the older Singhalese Commentaries - how a monk should behave towards his kinsfolk. "Parents", he says, "should be tended like the preceptor. Indeed, even if they are placed in royal authority, they yet expect service from their son, the latter should serve them. If they have no medicine, he should give them his own. If he has none, he should seek for it in going round for alms and give it to them. But as for his brothers and sisters, he should compound medicine belonging to themselves and give it to them. If they possess no medicine, he should give his own for the time being, and should take it when given afterwards, but should not press for it, if it is not given. He should not make medicine for, nor give it to, his sister's husband, who is no kinsman. But he should give it to his sister, saying 'Give it to your husband.' And the same with one's brother's wife. But their sons being kinsmen, it is proper to make medicine for them".¹

In the *Samantapāsādikā* the same point is explained in greater detail. Besides the parents there are ten

1. P.P. II pp 110-111; VI I 94, 95.

others whom it behoves a bhikkhu to tend in case of their illness. They are: elder brother, younger brother, elder sister, younger sister, maternal aunts junior and senior to the mother, paternal uncles junior and senior to the father, father's sister and maternal uncle's wife. With regard to the children of these ten relations, no Vinaya rule is violated by giving medical treatment to them and to those connected with them up to the seventh family circle. If the husband of a sister or the wife of a brother is ill, and if he or she is a (blood) relation, the monk may give medicine to him or her directly. If not, the medicine should be given through the monk's sister or brother or through the children of one of them. The monk should act in the same manner as this towards the parents of his teacher, but in giving them medicine he should first transfer its ownership to the teacher and then bestow it on the latter's parents. A teacher, too, should act in like manner towards the parents of his pupil.

If, however, a stranger, a robber, a chief defeated in battle, a poor man or villager neglected by his relations, were to be indisposed and come to the monastery and even if that person were not a blood relation of the monk, medicine should be given to him, but without expectation of reward.¹

The *Saṃantapāsādikā* contains also an account of a well-known thera at *Getiyapabbata* who gave food and showed

1. *Snp* II 469 foll.

hospitality to a robber who came to plunder the monastery. By the kindness thus shown, we are told, the robber was converted and became thenceforth an ardent protector of the vihāra. A complaint was brought later by some bhikkhus against the there for giving to a robber the property that belonged to the community of monks. The there was, however, successful in showing proving that the attitude he took was correct.¹

The rules of ~~social~~ social conduct described in the Commentaries and of which the foregoing are a few examples, are taken partly from the Canonical Vinaya and partly from what is known as the Pāliuttaka ² Vinaya. The latter embodies rules of conduct in relation to many aspects of a monk's life and provides a wide and interesting field of research into the growth of the Vinaya in Ceylon and also to a considerable extent into the social conditions that prevailed in the island at the time when such development took place.

1. Sup II 474

2. This term has been explained in an earlier chapter (Part I ch.4).

CHAPTER IX

The Growth of Ritual.

A religion which enters into the everyday life of a people is very likely to be influenced or corrupted by the beliefs and superstitions of that people. Adherents of a religion do not corrupt it consciously or in a day. The process is gradual and one is able to see a substantial difference only when the beliefs current in two periods not too close to one another are compared and contrasted. In the Buddhist literature of Ceylon we have two such periods, having a mass of literature belonging to each, namely, the Pāli Pitakas and the Pāli Commentaries. We are however unfortunate in not being able to know definitely the dates of the Pitakas in their present form and of the compilation of the original Sinhalese Commentaries which were translated into Pāli by Buddhaghosa and his successors.

Though the Pitakas were committed to writing as late as the first century B.C. there is not sufficient reason to believe that they received any substantial additions after they were brought to the island by Mahinda. The Parivāra of the Vinaya Pitaka is clearly an exception. Its compilation either in its entirety or in some of its parts including the introduction was done in Ceylon. As it has been

pointed out elsewhere the Buddhavaṃsa, too, has received some additions. With regard to the rest of the Canon the case is different. Whenever an addition to the Canon was made by the Sinhalese bhikkhus, care was taken to record that fact in the Commentaries. An example of this nature is seen in the Sumaṅgala vilāsinī, which says that the verses beginning with "Attha-
donna sakkhanta sarira" of the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta of the Dīghanikāya ¹ were composed by the theras of Ceylon.² ~~As the~~
~~other about the Commentaries had a gradual growth in Ceylon, and~~
~~as we have shown in an earlier chapter, they were compiled in~~
For this as well as for other reasons we may safely consider that the Pāli Piṭakas on the whole depict a Theravāda Buddhism of a pre-Mahindian day.³ On the other hand the Commentaries had a gradual growth in Ceylon, and as we have shown in an earlier chapter they were compiled in the Sinhalese language probably in the first century A.D. Nevertheless, their growth was not arrested until they were translated into Pāli in the fifth century AD. Therefore the beliefs, forms of worship and the like which are absent in the Canon and are to be found in the Commentaries may well be regarded as having grown in Ceylon or, at least, as being prevalent in the island at the time the Sinhalese Commentaries were written. In the present chapter we shall deal with some of these beliefs and forms of worship.

1. D II pp 167-168

2. Sum VII II 615

3. See Rhys Davids : Buddhist India pp 174 foll.

Veneration of cetiya and Bodhi trees was a prominent feature in the religion of ancient Ceylon. It was only at a later stage that images came to be so ⁷referred. As Sir Charles Eliot remarked: "It is one of the ironies of fate that the Buddha and his followers should be responsible for the growth of image worship, but it seems to be true. He laughed at sacrifices and left to his disciples only two forms of religious exercise, sermons and meditation. For Indian monks, this was perhaps sufficient, but the laity craved for some outward form of worship. This was soon found in the respect shown to the memory of the Buddha and the relics of his body, although Hinduism never took kindly to relic worship."¹

Cetiya

The sanctuaries in which were deposited relics of the Buddha or of his holy disciples were known as Sakti Cetiya, Thūpas ^(Stupas) or Dagābas (a later word used in Ceylon). In some Commentaries the word cetiya has a more extensive meaning as we see from its division into the two classes: (1) Sāriya-cetiya, one containing a relic of the body of the Buddha or of an Arhant and (2) Paribhoga-cetiya, containing an article such as the bowl used by the Buddha. The Bodhi tree was also considered to belong to this group, for the Buddha attained Enlightenment under it. A sāriya-cetiya was of greater importance than a paribhoga-cetiya.² In the Dhammapadāṭṭhakathā is

1. Hinduism and Buddhism. Vol 4 p 171
2. Pap Sn 878, Man II 6, 7.

given a third group called the Uddissa-cetiya.¹ As far as I am aware, the word occurs only in this Commentary and even here it appears to be an interpolation.² An uddissa-cetiya signified an image or some other object made to resemble the figure of the Buddha. In later ~~the~~ works the classification always consists of these three groups and the uddissa-cetiya occupies the third position in order of importance.

Veneration of the cetiya originated in India as is evidenced by the stūpa at Sāśibi, which in the opinion of Cunningham was built before the time of Asoka³, and also by the stūpa of Piprāvī on the borders of Nepal.⁴ Buddhaghosa's account in the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* that Mahākassapa instigated Ajātasattu to collect the relics of the Buddha and place them in a stūpa may also have a historical foundation,⁵ but it is not possible to say how far relics were then regarded as objects of worship. According to the *Manorathapurāṇī* a cetiya originally meant a dwelling place of the yakkhas and the Buddha is said to have resided often during the first twenty years of his ministry at the Gotamaka, Cāpala, Sārandada and the Bahuputta cetiyas, that is, at the dwelling ~~in~~ places of the

1. *J Dha* III 251

2. Two reasons lead me to consider this as an interpolation : (a) The word, if it occurred in the original Commentary, should, as it is more appropriate, come third and not between *sāririka-cetiya* and *paribhoga-cetiya*, and (b) as seen from the P.T.S. Edition several of the Mss. omit this word from the Text-text.

3. Rhys Davids : *Buddhist India* p 288

4. *Hinduism and Buddhism* Vol III p 23

5. *Sum* VII II I 611. Also see *Hinduism and Buddhism*, Vol III pp 23, 24

yakkhas having these names.¹ Many of these asik setiyan such as the Aggellava and the Gotamaka were converted into Buddhist vihāras, but they still retained the original names.² The dressing-hall of the Halla kings was also known as a setiya. It was so called because the hall was coloured or painted. (gittaka)³.

The Buddha himself is said to have caused setiyan to be built depositing in them relics of several of his disciples who were Arahants, such as Sāriputta and Moggallāna.⁴ It may here be noticed that four kinds of people are mentioned as being worthy to be respected by building thūpas, enshrining their relics, namely, a Buddha, a Paccekabuddha, a disciple of a Buddha (Tathāgata-sāvako) and a Cakkavatti king.⁵ The Digha-nikāya which mentions these four makes no distinction between an Arahant and an ordinary virtuous disciple of the Buddha, but its Commentary, the Sumaṅgalavilasini, has taken it for granted that only an Arahant disciple is ~~meant~~ meant here and gives as a reason for excluding the ordinary virtuous disciples, that if they were also included the thūpas of such disciples would have covered the whole of Ceylon and other Buddhist countries and consequently suffered by being too common.⁶

to
According to the Buddha Dhammapadam atthakatha, the

1. Man II 373. Also see Sun VII II 554

2. PJ II 33 344

3. Sun VII II 596

4. DhA III 251 & 3 ; Sun VII II 554

5. D II 142

6. Sun VII II 583, 584

Buddha praised a man who paid respect to the cetiya of a the former Buddha Kassapa, though the man did not know the significance of the cetiya at the time he was worshipping it.¹ The same Commentary informs us that the Buddha was born in a previous birth as the brāhmaṇa Saṅkha and that then he cleared away the grass that had grown on the compound of the cetiya containing the relics of the Paścekabuddha, Susima, spread sand there and offered flowers of the forest at the cetiya. The harvest of these meritorious deeds he reaped in abundance in his last birth as the Buddha.² The Buddhavaṃsaṭṭhakathā, too, has a story which shows how a previous Buddha, Maṅgala by name, while he was yet a Bodhisatta, honoured the cetiya of a still earlier Buddha.³ How old these Commentarial narratives are and how they grew we are unable to say, but it is interesting to note that so important a place should have been given to cetiya worship in the Commentary of the Dhammapada, which of all books of the Pāli Tipitaka assigns a decidedly insignificant value to reliance on this kind of worship. Two verses in the Dhammapada may be quoted to illustrate this:

Saṃsāraṃ yaṃ jaraṇaṃ yaṃti-

paṭṭatāni vaṇandāni

āyama rūkha cetiyāni -

maruṇṇā bhavatajjitā.

1. DhA III 251

2. Ibid. III 448

3. BuA 117

~~Maṅkama~~ ~~Maṅkama~~ ~~Maṅkama~~ ~~Maṅkama~~ - ~~Maṅkama~~ ~~Maṅkama~~ ~~Maṅkama~~ ~~Maṅkama~~
 Maṅkama ~~Maṅkama~~ ~~Maṅkama~~ - ~~Maṅkama~~ ~~Maṅkama~~ ~~Maṅkama~~ ~~Maṅkama~~.¹

These verses leave us with no doubt as to the original Buddhist attitude towards the kind of ritual such as we are now considering.

Whatever the original attitude may have been, the construction of cetiya began in Ceylon at a very early date. Mahinda is reported to have said to Devanampiyatissa that he (i.e., Mahinda) was desirous of returning to India as he had not seen the Buddha for a long time, meaning thereby that he had not seen the Buddha's relics. The king understood the hint and made speedy preparations to build a ~~stupa~~ ^{thūpa}.² He is also said to have built many other smaller cetiya at a distance of a yojana from one another.³ This example set by Devanampiyatissa was followed by many of his successors, the most noteworthy among them being Dutthagamiṇi, ^{and} who caused the

1. Dhammapa & vv 188, 189

188. "To many refuges men verily
 betake themselves when peril makes afear'd;
 to hills and woods, to gardens, trees and
 shrines.

189. Nay, this refuge no haven is,
 nay, this refuge is not supreme
 Not when to this refuge he's come
 is he from every ill set free."

Mrs Rhys Davids : The Minor Anthologies of
 the Pali Canon. Part I pp 65, 67

2. Sap I 83

3. Lv 20.12. Also see 20.45

erection of the Mahācetiya and whose faith in the veneration of relics was so great that he had had a relic put into his spear, the royal standard, when he set out to fight the Tamils.¹

The belief that the existence of his relics was equivalent to the existence of the Buddha himself (Chātum hi thitāya Buddha thitā ya hanthi)² was deep rooted in the heart of the Sinhalese Buddhist. According to the *Dumāṅgalavilāsinī*, the relics of long-liv^d Buddhas remain as inseparable masses, but in the case of our Buddha, Gotama, they separated into pieces of varying size. For, the Buddha thought that as he would pass away before long, before his āsana spread in every quarter, the relics should be available to the people so that they, who make a cetiya with a relic even as small as a mustard seed and venerate it, may attain a happy state after death.³ The Buddha is said to have ^{caused} a cetiya to be built near a four-way junction with the relics of the minister, Santati, who attained Arhantship and passed away as a lay disciple, in order that people may venerate it and acquire merit (maḥāyāga vanditvā puṇṇabhāgā bhavissatī ti)⁴. The very sight of a cetiya was considered to be a most desirable thing.⁵ It was also held that when a layman went to pay his veneration at a cetiya or at a Bodhi tree he performed thereby a bodily act of love (mettāya pīyākamaṇaṇa), and when he uttered the words

1. Mv 25.1

2. EV 431, Pap Sm 881

3. Sum VII II 604

4. DhA III 83

5. V1 I 91

"Let us go to worship a cetiya at or a Bodhi tree", he performed a vocal act of love (~~mettan~~ ~~vaḍḍhana~~) .¹ Merits acquired by worshipping a cetiya were still greater. "If," says the ~~Sumanāgalavillāsini~~, ~~suxa~~ one who set out with a delighted mind to worship a cetiya, were to die on his way, he would forthwith be born in a happy state."² Instances are not wanting of people who were believed to have taken rebirth in a deva-world as a result of building a cetiya. Gopakasivallī, who caused the cetiya at Tālapitṭhikavihāra to be built may be cited as an example.³ On the other hand, destroying a cetiya was a deadly sin equal in gravity to those known as the ~~Anantariya kamma~~⁴ which are heinous deeds such as killing one's parents.

Beliefs such as these led to the making of cetiya-worship an important religious institution diligently sought after by the faithful disciples among both the monkhood and the laity. We have had occasion to refer many times in the preceding chapters to theras who went on pilgrimages to various cetiyas and also to some who came from abroad to worship the cetiyas in Ceylon.⁵ Laymen, too, went in large numbers. On great festive occasions connected with the worship of cetiyas, people used to assemble from all quarters, dressed to the best of their means in fine clothes, so much so that bhikkhus were

1. Sum VII II 531

2. Sum VII II 582. The same idea, though in a less developed state, is found in the Dighanikāya

3. SV 156

4. Man II 6, PapSn 878

5. See Sap Sn II 377

(see Vol II p 14

advised not to go to such assemblies lest their menatjal calm should be disturbed.¹

How a bhikkhu should worship a cetiya is explained in the Commentaries. "Full of zest obtained by thinking about the Buddha, one should ascend the courtyard of the cetiya. If the cetiya is big, he should circumambulate it thrice and bow down at four places. If it is small he should circumambulate in like manner and bow down ~~at~~ at eight places".² The acceptance of a particular routine of worship such as this, too, shows how far cetiya-worship had developed as a ritual.

Collar-bone
and
Tooth Relics.

Two relics belonging to the first group, that is, the sārixa-cetiya deserve special mention. They are the Buddha's collar-bone and the left eye-tooth. The former was brought to Ceylon a few months after the arrival of Mahinda, and king Devānampiyatissa built the Thupārāma Dāgāba at Anurādhapura enshrining the relic.³ The tooth relic found its way to Ceylon about five centuries later in the time of king Sirimeghavanna ⁴

The king placed the relic in a specially built shrine known as the Dantadhatughara and decreed that every year it should be taken from that place to the Abhayagiri-vihāra and held ceremonies there.⁵ Fa Hien, too, records the existence

-
1. SV 348, Sum VII I 184
 2. SV 349, Sum VII I 186
 3. Snp I 83 foll., Mv Ch.17
 4. Mv 37. 92-97
 5. Ibid. 37.97

of an organized annual ceremony held in honour of this relic at the time of his visit to Ceylon. The ceremony was held in the middle of the third month. Describing the ceremony Fa Hien records: "Ten days beforehand, the King magnificently exparisons a great elephant, and commissions a man of eloquence and ability to clothe himself in royal apparel and, riding on the elephant, to sound a drum and proclaim ~~as~~ as follows: 'Let all ecclesiastical and lay persons ~~withing~~ within the kingdom, who wish to lay up a store of merit, prepare and smoothe the roads, adorn the streets and highways, let them scatter every kind of flowers, and offer ~~a~~ incense in religious reverence to the Relic.' This proclamation being finished, the king next causes to be placed on both sides of the road representations of the 500 bodily forms which Bodhisattwa assumed, during his successive births. For instance, his birth as Su-ji-no; his appearance as a bright flash of light; his birth as the king of the elephants, and as an antelope. These figures are all beautifully painted in divers colours, and have a very life-like appearance. At length the tooth of Buddha is brought forth and conducted along the principal road. As they proceed on the way, religious offerings are made to it. When they arrive at the Abhayagiri Vihāra, they place it in the Hall of Buddha, where the clergy and laity all assemble in vast crowds and burn incense, and light lamps, and perform every kind of ceremony, both night and day, without ceasing. After ninety complete days

they again return it to the Vihāra within the city. This chapel is thrown open on the chief holidays for the purpose of religious worship, as the Law (of Buddha) directs."¹ This account is invaluable in that it shows to what extent ritual had become a part of the Buddhist religion by the end of the fourth century A.D.

The tooth relic played a more important part in Ceylon than did any other relic. In the words of Malalasekara: "The Tooth Relic from the time of its arrival in Ceylon obtained among the Sinhalese the position which the Palladium held in ancient Rome, for the sovereignty of the country belonged to the possessor of the venerated object. Even today, after the vicissitudes of many centuries, no relic commands more veneration than this. The wealth of the country was freely poured out in its honour. Wherever the palace of the king had to be erected, by reason of the incursions of invading foes, by its side, within the royal precincts, rose the Daladā-Māligava (the Palace of the Tooth Relic), smaller but incomparably more beautiful than the royal residence. Entire villages were dedicated to the maintenance of those whose business it was to supply offerings of rice and flowers and incense and oil, and one king at least offered up all his personal ornaments ~~and~~ as a mark of his devotion."² The relic was moved, for the reason mentioned above, from place to place some fifteen times.³ A

1. Beal; Travels of Buddhist Pilgrims, pp 155 foll

2. P.L.G. 67, 68

3. Eliot; Hinduism and Buddhism, Vol III p 26

relics, commonly believed to be this original one, is now at Kandy, the capital of the last Sinhalese king, and receives even today the veneration of the entire Buddhist population of the island.

The Commentaries contain also a tradition as to how the sāriṇa-dhātu (bodily relics) of the Buddha would disappear from the world. That disappearance is called the

Dhātu-
parinibbāna

dhātu-parinibbāna (complete extinction of the relics). When the end of the sāsaṇa draws nigh, the relics that are in Ceylon will collect together and make their way to the Mahācetiya. From there they will go to the Rājāyatana cetiya in Nāgadiipa and finally to the Mahābodhipallanka (Seat at the Great Bodhi Tree). Then other relics, too, that are in other spheres of the universe, namely, the worlds of the Nāgas, Devas and Brahmas, will arrive at the same place. Till then no relic even of the size of a mustard seed is destroyed. Having come together at the Mahābodhipallanka (in India) they will join together as a lump of gold and shed forth the six-fold radiance throughout the systems of ten thousand worlds. Then the deities of all these worlds will assemble and express their sorrow more intensely than they did when the Buddha passed away. None excepting the Anāgāmin and the Arhants will be able to remain unmoved. At last fire will spring from the relics and, blazing forth as far as the world of the Brahmas, will burn the relics entirely.¹

The bowl used by the Buddha and the sacred Bodhi Tree may be mentioned as the most important in the group known as the paribhoga relics . The vilāvatana tree and the precious throne-seat which the Buddha was believed to have given to the Nāgas were also regarded as coming under this group.¹

Bowl

The bowl used by the Buddha was brought to Ceylon during the reign of Devānampiyatissa.

This 'the king kept in his beautiful palace and worshipped continually with manifold offerings.'² Even as the tooth relic, this, too, was considered a valuable possession of the Sinhalese kings. When Vattagāmañipā Abhaya fled through fear of the Tamil invaders, he hid it in the Vessagiri forest,³ but one of the Tamils found it and, valuing it even more than the kingdom of Ceylon, took it away to India.⁴ Eliot compares the part played by this relic to that of the Holy Grail in Christian romance.⁵ Fa Hien saw it at Peshawar. He records that formerly a king of Yush-she invaded Peshawar with the main object of carrying away the bowl. Though he subdued the kingdom he was unable to remove the relic. At the time when Fa Hien visited the place the bowl was exhibited thrice daily and people made their offerings to it.⁶

Bodhi Tree

The veneration of the Bodhi Tree was as common and widespread as that of the

1. Mv 1.vv 68,69
2. Ibid. 20.vv 10,13
3. Ibid. 33.48
4. Ibid. 33.55
5. Hinduism and Buddhism Vol III p 24
6. Legge: Travels of Fa Hien , pp 34,35

ceiyas in ancient Ceylon and it exists so up to the present day. Bodhi Tree means the "Tree of Wisdom". But as Rhys Davids points out, 'the wisdom was the wisdom of the master not of the tree or of the tree-god, and could not be obtained by eating of its fruits.'¹ The reverence paid to the tree was 'not for its own sake, and not to any soul or spirit supposed to be in it, but to the tree as the symbol of the Master, or because ...
 it was under a tree of that kind that his followers believed that a venerated Teacher of old had become a Buddha. In either case it is a straining of terms, a ^{represent} misinterpretation or at best a misunderstanding, to talk of tree-worship'.¹

The Pippal tree (the Bodhi tree of the Buddhists) was held in high esteem before Buddhism arose, even as early as the Vedic period.² Many Buddhist sculptures ranging from the second century B.C. to the second A.D. and in which are represented the veneration of this tree have been discovered in India,³ and, no doubt, the practice existed from a much earlier date. Ananda Coomaraswamy is of opinion ' that every Buddhist temple and monastery in India once had its Bodhi Tree and flower-altar, as is still the case in Ceylon.'⁴ Tradition asserts, and the belief prevails widely in Ceylon, that the Bodhi-vṛjā or the veneration of the Bodhi Tree dates as far back as the time of the Buddha, for it is held that the ascetic

1. Buddhist India p 230

2. Ibid. p 231

3. See Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Vol 24.No 144

4. Ibid. No 144 p 54

at
 Siddhattha Gotama later he attained Nibbāna under this tree, remained there for seven days looking at the tree as a mark of gratitude to that which helped him with the cool shade of its leaves. This tradition, however, does not have the full support of the Pāli Commentaries. The Udanatthakatha and the Buddhavaṃsaatthakathā mention that the seat (nallanka) as well as the tree received the grateful gaze of the Buddha.¹ In another passage of the latter Commentary only the nallanka ^{ha} is mentioned;² and so is it in the Attasālinī and the Jātakaatthakathā.³

Whatever the origin of the practice was, its cult in Ceylon existed from at the time of Mahinda. According to the Samantapāsādikā and the Mahāvamsa, the southern branch of the sacred Bodhi Tree at Gayā was brought to Ceylon a short time after the advent of Mahinda. Amidst solemn festivities befitting the occasion, Devānampiyatissa planted this branch at Anurādhapura and it has drawn to this day many millions of devout pilgrims. The Mahāvamsa refers frequently to various acts of homage performed by kings that followed Devānampiyatissa.⁴ Fa Hien, too, refers to this tree in his memoirs.⁵ Saplings grown from the tree at Anurādhapura were planted in many places in the island.⁶

1. UdA 52, BuA 18

2. BuA 240

3. Att 12, J I 77

4. See e.g. Mv 28.1; 34.58; 36.25, 52, 56, 126; 37.15

5. Legge: Travels of Fa Hien, p 103

6. Snp 100.

But among all these the parent tree at Buddhagayā and its branch at Amurādhapura were held to be the most sacred. The Atthasālinī gives an account of a thera who went to India to pay his respects to the Great Bodhi.¹ King Sirimeghavanna is said to have sent two bhikkhus to India to king Han-nach-to-le-kiu-to, that is Samudragupta, requesting him to provide shelter there for the Sinhalese monks who were on a pilgrimage to the sacred tree at Bō-gayā.² Two inscriptions have also been found at Gayā which record the building of a temple and the gift of a statue by Mahānāma, a resident of Anradvipa and a member of the royal family of Ceylon. Cunningham is inclined to take this thera as the author of the Mahāvamsa and suggests that he may have once visited the Bodhi Tree in Magadha, where he built a temple and dedicated a statue.³ References to theras who went to venerate the one at Amurādhapura occur frequently in the Commentaries and we have alluded to them on many occasions.

That there was a Bodhi tree in each monastery in ancient Ceylon is also confirmed by the fact that tending the tree by watering it and cleaning its courtyard was regarded as the duty of every bhikkhu.⁴ The Samvohavinodanī tells us further that a bhikkhu who enters the courtyard of a Bodhi tree should venerate the tree behaving with humility as if he were in the presence of the Buddha.⁵ Destroying a Bodhi

1. Att 11, 12

2. Cul. tr. Vol I p 1 note 3

3. Cunningham: Mahabodhi, London 1892, p 60

4. SV 473, Sam Vā I 186, BA Sn III 152

5. SV 349

tree was considered a very grave sin. There are certain exceptions. If a branch obstructs a *thupa* or an image in which bodily relics of the Buddha are enshrined, or if a bird perching on a branch soil a *cetiya* underneath, that branch should be cut and removed. Similarly if the root of a Bodhi tree enters piercing the base of a *cetiya*, that root should be removed. But this should not be done if the building obstructed is one pertaining to the Bodhi tree, such as the Bodhi-chara, since the building is for the tree and not the tree for the building. If one lops off a diseased branch or a part that is rotten in order that the Bodhi tree may not perish, he thereby obtains merit as if he had tended the body (of a diseased person).¹

Images.

Thirdly, to the uddisaa group of *cetiyas* belong the images of the Buddha. Their veneration began much later than that of the relics and of the Bodhi tree. "The early Buddhists", says Cunningham, "had no statues of Buddha. He is not once represented in the sculptured bas-reliefs of Bharhut, which date from 150 to 100 B.C., and there is no image of him amongst the numerous scenes of the great Sanchi Stupa. The oldest representations of the Buddha, that I am aware of, are found on the coins of the Indo-Scythian king, Kanishka, about A.D. 100."² But the art of sculpture was certainly known and practised

1. Man II 6,7; Pap Sn 878

2. Cunningham: Mahabodhi, London 1892, p 53

by the Hindus as early as the time of Asoka as is seen from the old Buddhist Railing of the Mahābodhi Vihāra.¹ Foucher has discussed the subject in greater detail. According to him, in ancient Buddhist sculptures in such places as those mentioned above and at Amarāvati the figure of the Buddha is without exception left out in scenes where one would expect to see it. The Buddha's presence in these scenes is represented by a symbol such as a vacant seat, a promenade or caṅkamaṇa, the foot prints or the Bodhi Tree.² In the Xiāi Pāli Commentaries, too, there is hardly any mention of the statues of the Buddha. To my knowledge there is only one such instance,³ and it also refers not to an ordinary image (nāṭika) but to one in which is enshrined a relic of the Buddha and hence occupying the position of a thūpa than of a statue.

ever

The Mahāvapśa, however, enables us to form an idea of the growth of the Buddha-image in Ceylon. The first mention of it refers to the time of King Vasabha (127-171 A.D.). He caused to be made four beautiful images of the Buddha and a temple for them in the courtyard of the great Bodhi Tree.⁴ More than a century later king Vohāraṇa Tissa (269-291 A.D.) set up two bronze images in the eastern building of the Bodhi.⁵ At three entrances of the courtyard of this sacred tree Gopābhaya (309-322 A.D.) placed three statues made of stone.⁶

1. Cunningham : Mahābodhi p 33

2. A. Foucher: The Beginnings of Buddhist Art, and other Essays. London 1917, pp 5, 19, 72, 73,

3. Man II 6, repeated in Papsn 878. (104, 117

4. Mv 35.89

5. Ibid. 36.31

6. Ibid. 36.104

Mahāsena (334-361 A.D.) caused two bronze images to be set up on the west side of the building¹. After this, the construction of images and image-houses became quite common and their location is no longer limited to the courtyard and the vicinity of the Bodhi Tree. When the image of the Buddha was introduced to Ceylon the most natural place to keep it was under the Bodhi Tree and this is exactly what we see to have occurred. Fa Hien, too, records that he saw a very beautiful image in the same place. "Beneath the tree", he writes, "there has been built a vihāra, in which there is an image (of Buddha) seated, which the monks and commonalty reverence and look up to without ever becoming wearied".² In the Abhayagiri monastery also he saw a very beautiful image, more than twenty cubits in height.³ It is also significant that the earliest mention⁴ of a Buddha image in Ceylon refers to the second century A.D. and thus agrees remarkably with the date of its origin in India. Further, this fact shows in an interesting manner how innovations in the methods of Buddhist worship in India found their echo in the neighbouring island.

1. Mv 37.31

2. Legge: Travels of Fa Hien. p 104

3. Ibid. p 102 (36.128, 129)

4. The Mahāvamsa refers to an image placed near the Thūpārāma vihāra by king Devānampiyatissa and removed from there to Pācīnatissapabbatavihāra by King Jetthātissa. The possibility of such a thing as this is contrary to all that we know as to the date of the origin of the Buddha-image. It is, however, very likely, as Dr G.P. Mahipala suggested to me, that an image which stood near the Thūpārāma and the source of the construction

Religious
Festivities.

Along with the veneration of the relics and of the Bodhi Tree there grew up also the custom of holding religious festivities. Of these the Giribhanda-pūja of King Mahādāṭhika Mahānāga (67-79 A.D.) may be regarded as the best known.¹ Descriptions of many various other festivities of a minor and major character are given frequently in the Mahāvapasa . Saddhātissa is said to have made 84,000 offerings in honour of the 84,000 sections of the Dhamma (Dhammakkharanā).² This is worthy of notice as it appears to be the prototype of similar offerings (pūja) which are prevalent in Ceylon today. The usual articles of offerings to the cetiyas and Bodhi trees were flowers and lamps. According to the Mahāvapasa, King Duṭṭhagāmaṇi caused a thousand lamps, having in them white wicks fed with ghee, to burn perpetually in twelve places as offerings to the Buddha.³ King Vasabha 'had a thousand lamps lighted in four places; that is, on the Cetiya-pabbata, about the cetiya in the Thūpārāma, about the Great Thūpa and in the Temple of the great Bodhi-tree.'⁴ The same king gave the thera Mahāpaduma hundred kalāṣas to be spent for offering flowers.⁵

of which was forgotten by the people, was naturally attributed to the work of Devanampiyatissa as it was this king who built the

1 Thūpārāma.

1. Mv 34.75 foll.; Man I 22, Man Sn 670; Sum Vil II 335

2. Mv 33.12

3. Ibid. 32.37

4. Ibid. 35.80

5. Snp II 471

Recitation
of
Parittas

One other form of Buddhist ritual remains to be discussed; and that is the recitation of the Parittas. (Protection Suttas)

It is generally believed that the Buddha preached the Ratana Sutta at Vesālī to free the city from a plague and from the dangers of evil spirits.¹ As we have mentioned elsewhere, King Upatissa of Ceylon caused the monks to chant this Sutta in public at a time when the island was vexed by the ill of a famine and a plague, and it is said that immediate relief was the result of this public chanting.² Ever since this time the custom took deep root in Ceylon and exists up to the present day. The Suttas usually chanted are the Mangala, the Ratana and the Karaniyametta of the Khuddakapāṭha. If the ceremony is conducted over a long time the whole of the Pirit-paṭṭa or the Book of Parittas is chanted. The Suttas in this book are mostly of the nature of a code of ethics to be practised in one's everyday life and it is strange how such simple and profound, though highly practical, teachings have been shifted from the realm of life and conduct to that of ceremony and superstition.

The belief in the efficacy of the chanting of the Parittas is perhaps even older than the time of Upatissa. The Pāli Commentaries have several passages extolling its virtues. A young bhikkhu who was cleaning the Dīghavāpi Cetiya

1. See Pj #1 157
2. Mv 37.189-198

fell from the top of that building but, we are told, his life was miraculously saved as a result of invoking the help of the Dhajagga Paritta.¹ The Parittas such as the Aṭṭaṭṭiya, Mora, Dhajagga and Ratana are said to have their influence over ten thousand kay kay kotis (i.e., one hundred thousand million) of world-systems.² The Mahāsamaya Sutta was considered to be ~~ext~~ bringing delight to deities and it is, therefore, recommended for inviting luck.³

When laymen were ill, it was customary for the people to invite the bhikkhus to recite Paritta. The Samantapāsādikā describes which forms of invitation should be accepted and which should not be accepted.⁴ The Sumaṅgalavilāsinī explains in greater detail how a Paritta recitation should be conducted to heal a man possessed of a demon. In such a case, ~~sapaṭṭaṭṭa~~ ~~apṭṭakṭṭa~~, the Metta, Ratana and Dhajagga Suttas should be chanted for seven days, and if the evil spirit does not leave the man, then the Aṭṭaṭṭiya Sutta should be recited; but it should not be done without first chanting the Suttas mentioned before. During this period the bhikkhu who does the chanting should eat neither flesh nor food made out of flour nor should he dwell in a cemetery, and from the vihāra to the house of the layman who is ill he should be conducted well protected with shields. The chanting should be done inside a house. The doors and the windows of the house should be shut, and the bhikkhu

1. BA I 341

2. Man II 9, Pap Sn 880, BV 430

3. Sum Vil II 694

4. Snp II 472

protected by armed people surrounding him, should start the chanting keep^{ng}ish foremost in his heart thoughts of love. If the demon does not yet leave the man, the latter should be taken to the courtyard of a cetiya and Mangala verses should be chanted there. Failing in all these, the deities should be invoked saying : "Know ye, (O,deities) this spirit (amamissa) does not obey us. We shall do the orders of the Buddha". If a bhikkhu is possessed of an evil spirit, incense and flowers should be offered to the Buddha and, sharing the merit with those assembled, the other bhikkhus should chant Paritta for the benefit of the afflicted one.¹ The spirit should also be asked not to torment a virtuous monk.²

No words are necessary to indicate how far these rituals are from the spirit of the original, pure and unadulterated teaching of the Buddha as exemplified, especially, in the Dhammapada. The growth of ritual was a necessary one if the faith was to have a hold on the masses. It was bound to come. But there is always this satisfaction that these new practices, though they formed a part of the common religion of the masses, did hardly affect the Pīṭakas which the Sinhalese monk zealously protected from all possible accretions.

1. Sum VII III 969,970
2. Snp II 476

CHAPTER X

The Position of the Deities.

Along with the growth of ritual there grew also the attention paid to the denizens of the heavenly spheres. We cannot consider this attention paid to deities (devas or devatās) as a growth that took place entirely in Ceylon. The mention of devas is by no means a rare occurrence in the Sutta Pitaka. 'The significance of their appearance nearly always lies in their relations with the Buddha or his disciples.' As Sir Charles Eliot observes : "Their existence is assumed, but the truths of religion are not dependant on them, and attempts to use their influence by sacrifices and oracles are deprecated as vulgar practices similar to juggling. Later Buddhism became infected with mythology and the critical change occurs when deities, instead of being merely protectors of the church, take an active part in the work of salvation. When the Hindu gods developed into personalities who could appeal to religious and philosophic minds as cosmic forces, as revealers of the truth and guides to bliss, the example was too attractive to be neglected and a pantheon of Bodhisattvas arose. But it is

clear that when the Buddha preached in Kosala and Magadha, the local deities had not attained any such position. The systems of philosophy then in vogue were mostly not theistic, and, strange as the words may sound, religion had little to do with the gods. If this be thought to rest on a mistranslation, it is certainly true that the dhamma had little to do with devas.¹

These remarks are also true to a very considerable extent with regard to Buddhism in Ceylon as represented by the Pali Commentaries. The old Canonical accounts dealing with the devas were expanded and mythology grew round them, but to the Ceylonese Buddhist these devas were still merely classes of living beings, some of them such as the Great Brahma and Sakka being devout followers of the Buddha and others such as the sinful Māra (Pāpimā Māro) being opponents of the Great Teacher and those who followed his teachings. Even the greatest gods of the Brāhmanic pantheon were in their status considered to be far below the Buddha and his virtuous disciples. How low these deities bent before the majesty of the Buddha is seen from the following incident which, the Commentaries say, took place in the morning of the day of his Enlightenment. Early in the morning, Sujātā, the wife of the chieftain Senani, was preparing a milk-rice pudding to be offered to the deity of the sacred banyan tree in her village. Though she was unaware of it at that time, the Buddha was to be the recipient of the offering. As it was the last meal which

the latter was to partake of before his Enlightenment, all the great deities of the world assembled in her kitchen and assisted her in the cooking. The four Guardian Deities of the world kept watch over the oven, the Great Brahma held a parasol over it, Sakka (the Indra of the brāhmanas) kept the fire burning by adjusting the firewood ! ¹

The legends connected with these deities are not devoid of their humour. Thus when the Bodhisatta is seated under the Bodhi Tree immediately before his Enlightenment, all the great devas, including Sakka and Brahmā, come to sing his praises. Then arrives the dreadful Māra with his ghostly legions. The Bodhisatta remains unperturbed, but these great devas are terrified at the sight of Māra and take flight in helter-skelter. Sakka takes to his heels with his conch Vijayuttara hanging on his back and does not stop till he reaches the edge of the universe. The Great Brahma flies to his world leaving his white parasol behind.²

Such being the attitude of the early Buddhists in Ceylon towards the deities, we cannot expect to find them engaged in praying to or worshipping deities. There is, indeed, no evidence in the Pāli Commentaries of the practice of any ritual to propitiate them. As it was mentioned in an earlier chapter³ when king Gajabahu (174 - 196 A.D.) brought from

1. J. I. 68

2. Ibid. I 72

3. Also see P.L.G. 50

South India twelve thousand Colian prisoners, along with them arrived also the cult of many Hindu gods and goddesses. But how far this cult affected the Buddhism of that day we are unable to say definitely. The Mahāvamsa tells us that King Mahāsena destroyed three devālavas (houses or temples of gods) and built viharas in their place.¹ In the Sumaṅgalavilāsini it is said that a bhikkhu in need of thread to stitch his robes may pick up any thread left on the streets or at altars (devatthana) or brought by someone and offered to him by placing it at his feet.² Here we have reference to some ritual in connection with the worship of the devas, but it may as well be that the ritual was one performed by the non-Buddhists of Ceylon.

Though the ritual side of it is absent we cannot ignore the effects of the growth of mythology, as this, too, is a potent factor in influencing the minds of the common folk. And a study of the religious conditions of early Ceylon would be incomplete without, at least a brief, survey of the Aṭṭhakatha legends connected with the deities referred to above. It should also be mentioned that these legends may have been influenced by those in the Brāhmanic literature of India, but it is beyond the scope of this work to enter into a comparative study of the two. Nor is it possible to give here a detailed account of all the deities mentioned in the Commentaries.

1. Mv 37.40

2. Sum Vil III 1012

The Brahmins

The highest among the Buddhist deities are the Brahmins. They are said to lead pure lives and to be free from the enjoyment of sense-pleasures. Some of the most sublime virtues in Buddhism such as brahmacariyā and the brahma-vihāra are called after their name. They are also said, as mentioned before, to have attended on the Buddha frequently both before and after his Enlightenment. Thus at the moment of Prince Siddhattha's birth four Great Brahmins, pure in thought, received in him with a golden net¹; immediately afterwards when he walked the seven steps (satta-pada-vīṭhāra) proclaiming his supremacy over the whole universe, the Great Brahmin followed, holding a parasol over him² and when the prince announced the home-life to become the Buddha, the Great Brahmin Chappikāra brought to him the eightfold requisites of an ascetic.³

The names of many Brahmins are mentioned in the Canon as well as in the Commentaries. That of the Brahmin Sahampati occurs several times. According to the Jātakatthakathā he was the first to request the Buddha to preach the Truth discovered by the latter.⁴ According to another Commentary he offered the Buddha a jewelled garland as big as the Mountain Sineru.⁵ It is interesting to note that this Brahmin is said

-
1. J I 52
 2. Ibid. I 53
 3. Ibid. I 65
 4. Ibid. I 81
 5. Pj I 171

to have come to Ceylon to attend on a thera on the occasion of the latter's attaining to Arahantship. In this visit the Brahman was accompanied by the Four Great Kings (Cattaro Mahārājādo) and Sakka.¹ The Brahman Harita, whose name also occurs in the Mahāsamaya Sutta , appears to be the chief of the Brahman even as Sakka is the chief of the devas.² On the other hand, the Brahman Sanan Kumāra appears often to take the rôle of a preacher among the deities.³ A list of the different classes of Brahman is given in the Sumāṅgalavilāsinī. The Suddhāvāsas or those of the Pure Abode occupy the highest position.⁴

Sakka and
his group.

Sakka is the deity who is mentioned most in the Pāli Commentaries. Even in the Canon his name is of frequent occurrence. He is the Indra⁵ of the pre-Buddhist Indian pantheon, now a devout follower of the Buddha. In the Vedas we find him as a 'demon-slaying Soma-drinking' deity. Now he is 'the heavenly counterpart of a pious Buddhist king. He frequently appears in the Jātaka stories as the protector of true religion and virtue, and when a good man is in trouble, his throne grows hot and attracts his attention. His transformation is analogous to the

1. EV 352, Pj II 56

2. Sum VII I 40, II 693, BuA 132

3. Sum VII II 650, 666

4. Ibid. II 510, 511

5. He appears also under the name Purandara,
DhA I 264

process by which heathen deities, especially in the Eastern Church, have been accepted as Christian saints.¹ Instances are however not entirely lacking of Sakka's tendency to appear in his pre-Buddhist garb. Thus in the Abbhantara Jātaka he plots to destroy a number of ~~some~~ ascetics.² Again we find him stealing a Tooth-relic of the Buddha from the hands of Dona, who distributed the relics³, and, on another occasion, he incites the bhikkhus to deceive king Ajātasattu.⁴

The Pāli Commentaries refer often to the attention paid by Sakka to the personal needs of the Buddha.⁵ He is also said to have taken a keen interest in the affairs of Ceylon. According to the Mahāvamsa he was asked by the Buddha himself to protect Ceylon.⁶ Accordingly he sought out Mahinda and requested him to go over to Sāmyam the island as the time for its conversion approached.⁷ When king Dutthagāmiṇi contemplated the building of the Mahāsthūpa, Sakka sent his attendant Vissakamma⁸ to make bricks for the king⁹ and later when the time for the enshrining of relics came, he sent Vissakamma again to decorate the whole of Ceylon.¹⁰ Sakka

-
1. Eliot: Hinduism and Buddhism Vol I p 333
 2. J II 394
 3. Sum Vil II 609
 4. Ibid. II 610
 5. See e.g., J I 60, 80; DhA III 269
 6. Mv 7. 2-4
 7. Ibid. 13.15, 16
 8. For other duties entrusted by Sakka to Vissakamma see Man II 136; Sum Vil II X 613, 614, 630; Mv 18.24 foll., 31.31
 9. Mv 28.6 foll.
 10. Ibid. 31.34

himself, records the Mahavamsa, attended the ceremony which was attended also by Brahmā, the gods Saptasikha¹ and Suyāna and a host of other deities.¹ It is, however, said that their umbrellas and not the deities themselves were visible to men on that occasion.²

During the Candālatissa (also called Brāhmanatissa) Peril Sakka advised the bhikkhus of Ceylon to go over to India and, so the legend proceeds, he even created a raft for the purpose.³ The Sumāṅgalavilāsinī records that he went frequently to Piyāguṇipā in Ceylon to invite the bhikkhus there to celebrate the Pavāraṇī Ceremony (held at the end of the rainy season).⁴

It was also believed in Ceylon - and the belief prevails even at the present day - that Sakka kept a record of the good deeds done by men on this earth. The Sumāṅgalavilāsinī gives an interesting description of how this record is made. The Four Great Kings, their sons and their ministers set out on the full-moon, new-moon and the fourteenth day of the lunar month respectively. In a golden book they write down the good deeds done by men and hand it over to Paścasikha.⁵ The

1. *Ibid.* 31.75

2. *Ibid.* 31.89

3. *Man* I 98

4. *Sum* VII II 648.

5. The deity who is the musician (Gandhabba) of Sakka. See *Sum* VII II 640, 647; *Man* I 127. According to the Mahavamsa (31.82) this deity, too, attended the ceremony of enshrining relics in the Mahāthūpa in Ceylon.

latter gives it to Mātali¹ who in turn submits it to Sakka. Then Sakka reads it in the assembly of devas, who rejoice greatly if men have done many meritorious deeds.²

In addition to the deities mentioned above as belonging to the retinue of Sakka, we read also of his four daughters and his elephant. His daughters ^{are} ~~named~~ Asā (Wish), Sādhā (Faith), Siri (Prosperity) and Hiri (Modesty).³ These names suggest that they are personifications of certain mental states and they bear a striking resemblance to the names of the three daughters of Māra, viz., Tanhā (Craving), Arati (Discontent) and Raga (Attachment)⁴, the difference being, as one would expect it, that the latter represent a set of states of mind undesirable from the Buddhist point of view. The description of Sakka's elephant, Erāvaka, affords interesting reading. He ~~it~~ is said to be a deity belonging to the class called Kāmarūpi (capable of assuming any form at will). When Sakka desires to go to his parks Erāvaka assumes the form of an elephant and takes Sakka on his back.⁵

1. The charioteer of Sakka. See J I 202, II 254.

2. Sum VII II 650. The belief that the Four Great Kings make such a record is found even in the Canon, but that belief is developed to a marked extent in the Commentaries. See *Anguttaranikāya* Vol I pp 142 foll.

3. J V 392

4. Pj II (2) 544

5. For a detailed description see Pj II 368, Sum VII II 688.

The Four Great Kings.

Holding posts under Sakka are the Four Great Kings (Cattāro Mahārājāno), also called the Guardians of the World (Loka-pāla). They are Dhatarattha, Virūḍha, Virūpakka and Vessavana and are mentioned in the Atanāṭiya Suttanta¹ of the Dīghanikāya. The Commentary has interesting notes on them. These notes evidently embody beliefs that were current in Ceylon at the time of the compilation of the Atthakatha. The Suttanta itself appears to be a later addition to the Dīghanikāya, though very likely it is of Indian Origin.

According to the Commentary, Vessavana was a particular friend of the Buddha and was proficient in the art of speaking.² He was also known by the name Kuvera.³ As it was in the case of Sakka, here too the change that took place in the character of Vessavana after his conversion is shown to be very marked. The Parasatthajotika tells us that in his earlier days he used to kill thousands of yakkhas⁴ with his gadā (mace).⁵ In the Basantapāsādikā, too, it is said that before he became a Sotāpanna he was in the habit of killing Kumbhāras⁶ by staring at them.⁷ After his conversion,

1. D. Sutta No. 32.

2. 4. The yakkhas are described as terrestrial deities (bhūma-devatā) in Man Sn 726.

3. 5. Pj II 225.

6. A class of minor deities. See Sum Vil III 964.

5. 7. Smp II 440.

6. A class of minor deities. See Sum Vil III 964.

7. Smp II 440.

however, he became a protector of the righteous. The *Jātakattha-kathā* records the death of one Vessavaṇṇa and the appointing of another by Sakka.¹ This is a good illustration of the Buddhist point of view with regard to the nature of deities. They are as mortal as human beings are, and their systems of government and the like are but a *va* counterpart of the systems that prevailed among men. In the *Mahāsaṃyāsa*² and the *Apāṇḍitya*³ *Suttas* *Datarattha* is mentioned as the ruler of the *Gandhabbas* (heavenly musicians)⁴. But the *Samaṅgalavilāsinī* describes him as a *Hapaṇḍala* (King of the swans) with a retinue of ninety thousand swans.⁵ As pointed out by Rev. H. Morris popular etymology may have had something to do with this change. In Pāli, *Hapaṇḍala* may also mean 'King Hanṣa', who in Indian mythology was a chief of the *Gandharvas*.⁶ *Virūḍhaka* and *Virūḍhaka* do not appear so frequently as the other two in the Pāli Commentaries.

These four deities are said to have protected the Buddha's mother from the day of his conception to the day of his birth⁷ and seven weeks after his Enlightenment to have given him four earthenware bowls which miraculously became one.⁸

1. J I 328

2. D. Vol II p 257

3. Ibid. Vol III p 197

4. Sam VII II 498

5. Sam VII I 40. Also see Pap II 6

6. J. P. T. S. 1893 p 24

7. J I 51

8. Ibid. I 80; Bua 2

We find then, as noted before, visiting Ceylon also, once to wait on Alindakavāsi Phussa-deva there¹ and again to take part in the ceremony at the Mahācetiya.²

In some Commentaries the legends connected with these deities are more developed than in others. Thus in the *Sumaṅgalaviḷāsini* it is said that there are similar Guardian Deities having the same names in all the ten thousand world-systems.³ The *Netti Atthakathā* gives another set, viz., Indra, Yama, Varuna and Kuvera as the names of the Lokapālas.⁴ Indra, mentioned in this list, is evidently another term for Sakka whom we have already discussed. Yama⁵, too, is one of the Brahmanic deities 'at first adopted by Buddhism'. He is mentioned in the *Devadūta Sutta* of the *Anguttaranikāya*⁶, a Sutta added probably at a later date to the Canon. In this Sutta it is said

that there are Guards of the Underworld (*Kṛtāx*)
 Yama (*Nirayapālas*) to assist Yama. There were some
 theras in Ceylon who did not believe that in
 the existence of *Nirayapālas* as they held that *Kṛtāx* was
 powerful enough to bring about due retribution to evil doers.
 The orthodox school seems to have held the former belief.⁷

1. SV 352

2. LV 31. 79

3. Sum VII II 687

4. MA 5

5. In the *Jātakatthakathā* (II 318) he is called *Vasāyī*.

6. A I pp 138 foll.

7. Man II 227, Pap Sn 953, Sum VII III 809.

When a person is born in hell (Niraya), it is the Nirayapala who takes him to Yama to obtain the final decision as to whether that person is to remain in hell or not. A man who has sinned excessively, we are told, is not taken to Yama, for in his case there is no question that he must suffer the torments of hell.¹ Yama is a righteous king.² He tries his best to save a person from falling into Niraya. Yama asks him to recall some good deed that he has done. Even at the eleventh hour if he can recall a good deed, that enables him to take birth in a happy world. The Manorathapūraṇī tells us that Dighajantu, the Tamil, offered a piece of red cloth to the Akṣacetinya of Sumanagirivihāra (Adam's Peak). Nevertheless, on account of his other misdeeds he was born in Niraya and the raging flames brought to his memory the piece of silk cloth he had ~~offered~~ offered. This at last enabled him to take birth in a happy state.³ If the person cannot remember a good deed himself, Yama tries, if possible, to give him a clue. The Papañcasūdanī has an interesting story to illustrate this. Once a minister in Ceylon offered a vase of jasmine flowers to the Mahācetiya and shared the merits with Yama. But, as in the case of Dighajantu, he too was born in Niraya and was taken before Yama. All the attempts of the latter to save him proved futile and, at last, Yama asked him "Did you not

1. Man II 230

2. Ibid II 228

3. Ibid. II 230

offer jasmine flowers ^{at} in the Mahācetiya and share the merits with me ? " The minister at once recalled to his memory this incident and thus he was able to escape from Niraya.¹ This belief in the efficacy of sharing merits with Yama seems to have originated in Ceylon and even today it exists in the island among some people.

According to the Manorathapūraṇī, Yama is a king of the Yamānīka Petas (the Departed Ones living in fairy mansions). Alternately he enjoys celestial pleasures and suffers the torments of hell. This Commentary presents the picture in a very developed form. Here it is said that the number of Yamas is not one but four.² In the Paramatthajotikā he is described as a person capable of infinite wrath, for when he is angered he kills numberless Dukkhaṇḍas by merely staring at them.³ It is difficult to harmonize these divergent pictures. What we find now is perhaps a curious conglomeration of old and new beliefs that were current in Ceylon and which found their way gradually into the Sinhalese Commentaries during the process of their growth.

Suyāma
and
Santusita

Higher in status than the deities
so far,
discussed above excepting the Brahmas,
are Suyāma and Santusita. We find them
often coming in the company of other devas

1. Pap Sn 955
2. Man II 228
3. Pj II 225

to pay their respects¹ to the Buddha. According to the Mahāvagga they, too, came to Ceylon to take part in the celebrations in connection with the Mahāthūpa in Anurādhapura.¹

Māra

Still higher in status than these deities is Māra, the Sinful One.² As far as might is concerned he excels all other devas, not excluding the Brahmāṇḍa. Māra, as depicted in the Pāli Canon and the Commentaries, is the result of an inextricable mixture of legend, myth and personification of evil. He appears frequently in the Canon, but the accounts of him in the Commentaries are of a more *developed* nature. His name *Māra Pāpina* 'corresponds to the *Mṛtyuṃśa pāpina* of the Vedas, but as a personality he seems to have developed entirely within the Buddhist circle and to be unknown to general Indian mythology.'³

Māra is known to Buddhist literature under a large number of names: e.g., Adhipati (Chief),⁴ Antaka (End),^{4,6,12} Kṛla (Black),⁵ 7 Kṛha (Black),^{4,6,11} Macu (Death)⁹, Macourāja (King of Death)¹⁰, Maru (Death)¹⁰, Mahāseṇa (One with a large army)⁸, Namu (?)^{4,6,7}, Paṇḍita (Lord of beings)¹³, Paṇḍita (Kinman of the careless)^{4,6,7} and Vāsuvatti (Wielder of power)⁴. Some of these names are

1. LV 31.78

2. For a detailed discussion on this deity, see Windisch: *Māra und Buddha*.

3. Eliot: *Hinduism and Buddhism* Vol I p 337

4. SA I 169

8. MA 203

12. DhA I 366

5. Pmā 107

9. Pj II 351

13. Pp I 33

6. SumVil II 555.

10. Ibid. 338

7. Uda 367

11. Ibid. 350

explained in the Commentaries. Thus, for example, Māra is called Mahāsena because he has a large army that is composed of death-dealers, such as serpents, scorpions, poisons and weapons.¹ These names as well as their explanations show us clearly that Māra is predominantly a personification of death and also of what is regarded as evil. As shown before, the names of his daughters, too, point to the same conclusion.

His ambition is always to hinder the activities of good people and hence his appearance again and again to stop the ascetic Gotama from attaining Enlightenment. Failing in other attempts he is said to have concentrated all his efforts when he came for his well-known Māra-yudha accompanied by many legions of his followers.² The Pāṭhāna Sutta of the Sutta-nipāta leaves us with no doubt as to what his legions were. They were none other than sense-desires, aversion, craving and the like.³ The account of the struggle which the Buddha had at that moment with the forces of evil was couched in figurative language in true Indian fashion.⁴ At a later stage the figurative nature of the struggle was lost sight of, and, as already by the time of the Pāli Commentaries, the general belief which prevailed was that an actual war took place between the Buddha and Māra and that the latter was defeated by

1. KA 203

2. J I 71 foll.; F I II (2) 391; BuA 238 foll.

3. Suttanipāta P.T.S. Edition p 76. Also see E.J.Thomas: Life of Buddha as Legend and History, p 72

4. Eliot: Hinduism and Buddhism Vol I pp 327 foll.

the power of love and virtue of the Buddha.

In the Commentaries we find also a compromise between these two views of the nature of Māra and his legions. The *Samangālasavilāsinī* tells us that at the Bodhi-pallabhā (the seat under the Bodhi Tree) the Buddha defeated the three Māras : Devaputta (Deity), Maccu (Death) and Kilesa (Defilements)¹. Buddhaghosa's Commentaries know only three whereas in certain others Māra is given as fourfold² and in some even as fivefold.³ These five comprise the three mentioned before and Khandha (the aggregates of mind and body) and Abhinikkhāra (the preparation or working of kamma). In post-Atthakathā works of Ceylon Māra is invariably described as being fivefold.

Other minor
deities.

In addition to those mentioned above there are also a few other minor deities. Siva and Khandha are mentioned in the Uḷāna Atthakathā, but their names are brought forward only to show the futility of propitiating them.⁴ Several times reference is made to Rāhu, whose last physical body is said to be bigger than that of any other deity.⁵ But

1. *Sam* VII 1-109, III 858; also see *Ibid.* II 680; *DhA* IV 43; *Puṇṇa* 147; *SA Sn* III 35

2. *ItA* 136: Pj II (2) 436. As was pointed out in Part I ch. I there is no definite evidence to show that the latter Commentary is a work of Buddhaghosa, though it is attributed to him. It should also be mentioned that, as far as I am aware, the four Māras are not enumerated in the Commentaries.

3. *ApA* 95; *ItA* 120; *NA* 122

4. *UḷA* 351

5. *SA* I 108, 109

here, too, the chief object is to point out how he, despite his gigantic stature, appeared insignificant before the Buddha.¹ The Mahāvamsa introduces us to the deva Sumana of the Sumanakūṭa Mountain (Adam's Peak).² He is a local deity. According to the Papanāsāṇī his daughter Kālī was married to Dighataphala , a tree deity at Rājagaha in India.³

Metteyya
Bodhisatta.

Holding a unique position among all the deities is Metteyya Bodhisatta.⁴ According to the Mahāvamsa he is now a deva in the Tusita heaven, awaiting the time when he shall be born in the world of men and become the next Buddha.⁵ King Jetthatissa II , who was proficient in the art of ivory carving, made a beautiful image representing this Bodhisatta.⁶ Metteyya is not mentioned often in the Commentaries. If the Mahāvamsa account is correct, there is reason to believe that he was well known in Ceylon in the early part of the fifth century A.D., as we are told that when the theras of the Mahāvihāra read Buddhaghosa's first work in Ceylon, the *Vinayaśāstra* Visuddhimagga, they exclaimed in joy "Without doubt this is Metteyya".⁷ Buddhaghosa himself expresses that

1. Pap Sn 790

2. Mv 1.33

3. Pap Sn 813

4. Att 361, 415. The name Metteyya occurs again, but without any details , in Pj II 28.

5. Mv. 32.73

6. Ibid. 37. 101, 102

7. Ibid. 37.242

his aspiration is to be reborn in this world in the time of the Buddha Metteyya and attain Arhantship under his guidance.¹ The ideal of Bodhisattvaship, it should be noted, was not foreign to the Theravāda Buddhism in Ceylon in the time of Buddhaghosa. A striking proof of this fact is found in the *Visuddhimagga* where it is said that the highest virtue (sila) is 'that virtue of the perfections which arises for the sake of the emancipation of all beings'², which, of course, is the virtue of a Bodhisatta. The doctrine, however, attained its development in Mahayanism.³

Buddhist Cosmography.

A word should also be said in this connection on the cosmography of the Buddhists. The Buddhist view of the physical nature of the universe, with all its hells and heavens, is already found described in different parts of the Canon. The Commentaries furnish us with some more details. It would be interesting to study how far the Buddhist conception has been influenced by other schools of religious literature in India, but here again such an investigation is beyond the range of the present work. W. Kirfel in his Die Kosmographie der Indier has dealt in considerable detail with the Buddhist conception of the universe. In the same work he has given separately the views of other Indian schools, thus

1. VI II 713; Att 431

2. P.P. I 16; Vi I 13

3. See Rhys Davids : *American Lectures* pp 199 foll
and Elist: *Hinduism and Buddhism* Vol I
p xxix.

making an investigation of the influence of them on Buddhism a comparatively easy task. It would suffice for us to deal here with the Buddhist point of view in the barest outline.¹

The χ Underworld or the Apāya consists of four divisions:

1. the animal kingdom (Tiracchāna - yonī),
2. the hells (Niraya, Naraka²),
3. the world of the departed beings (Petaloka)
- and 4. the world of the Asuras (Asuraloka).

The Naraka has eight chief divisions: Suppiya, Kalasutta, Sankhāra, Roruvā, Mahāroruvā, Tapara, Paṭipara and Avici. Each of these in turn has a large number of subdivisions (Vasāda-Narakas).³

Next comes the world of men (Jarassaloka) and above it are the six heavens (Sagga-loka):

1. Śatya Cātummahārājika, the Realm of the Four Great Kings,
2. Tāvātimsa, the Realm of Sakka,⁴
3. Yāma
4. Tusita, where , as mentioned before, the Metteyya

Bodhisatta is believed to dwell at present,⁵

1. What follows is more or less a mere enumeration of the contents of Kirfel's work KK pp 178-207.

2. Also called sometimes by the names Yamaloka (DhA I 334) Yama Yamakhaya and Yamasudana (J V 304).

3. See J. V. 270 *fol.*

4. The Mahāvamsa (32.72) says that king Dutthagāmi, too, was born in this world.

5. According to the Atthasālinī it was in this world that the Buddha preached the Abhidhamma. The same Commentary tells us that there were theras who did not hold this opinion. (att 21).

5. Nimmānareti, and

6. Paraniṇṇitavasa/vatti, the Earth Realm of Māra.

These eleven spheres, viz., the four Apāyas, the world of men and the six Sagga-lokas belong to the Kāma-loka or the world of sense-desires.

Higher than the Kāma-loka is the Rūpa-loka or the World of Form, the abode of the Brahmās who have a material body. It has fifteen subdivisions:¹

1. Brahmāparisaṃjja
2. Brahmāpurohita
3. Mahābrahma
4. Parittasubha
5. Appamāṇasubha
6. Abhassara
7. Parittasubha
8. Appamāṇasubha
9. Subhakinna
10. Vehapphala
11. Aviha
12. Atappa
13. Sudassa
14. Sudassi
15. Akāṇittha

1. In some books an Asaffhasatta is also mentioned (See Kirfel p 193). This is usually placed after Vehapphala

The last five are known as the *Suddhāvāśā* (Abodes of the Pure Ones).

Above all these is the four-fold *Arūpaloka* or the World of no-Form. It is the abode of the Brahmins who do not possess a material body.

Appendix I a

Names of Persons

(Ceylonese and those closely connected with Ceylon)

Mentioned in the Commentaries.

A

- Abhaya Snp I 63, II 474
 Snp Sn II 59, 377
 Vi I 36, 266
 Pap I 79, 290
 Man II 54
 Sv 273
 Att 399
 Sum VII II 530
- Abhaya (Prince) Snp I 90
- Abhaya (a thief) Snp II 473, 474
- Alandanāgarājamahesi ... Snp III 680
- Amula DhA IV 50
- Amulā (therī) Snp I 80, 90, 91
 Mv 19.65
- Amuruddha Snp III 698
- Arittha (Prince) Snp I 90, 101
- Arittha Snp I 62, 82, 102
- Atthadassi J I 1.

B

- Bhandika (Gatunikāyika) SA I 21
- Bhātiya (King) Snp II 305, 307
 Sv 440
 SA Sn III 119
 Man Sn 810, 811
 Mv 34.37 foll.
 Ep.Zey. III 154 155

Att 229, 230, 266, 267, 284
 SA II 276, SA Sn III 184, 206
 Pug.Pañ.Com. in J.P.T.S. 1914 pp 190,
 PsmA 405 (223)
 Vi II 398
 Sum VII III 744

Cūlapindapātika Tissa
 (of Girivihāra) ... Man II 215
 Cūlapindapātika Tissa
 (of Rohana) Man I 36
 Cūlasamudda Vi II 403
 Cūlasiva Vi I 170
 Cūlasiva (of Lokuttara) Sum VII III 883
 Cūlasiva (Samyutta-
 bhāṇaka) .. Vi I 313
 SV 446
 Cūlasu(dha)mma SV 452
 Cūlasumma (of Cittala-
 pabbata) . SV 489
 Vi II 634
 Cūlasumma (Tipitaka) Sum VII II 514
 Cūlasumma (, ,) Pap I 230

D

Damila devi (queen) .. Man I 22
 Mv 35.48
 Damila doverika Man II 215
 Datta Smp Sn II 377
 Dattabhaya Att 268
 Dattabhaya
 (of Potaliyavihara) Man II 173
 Deva Smp I 62
 Mv 36.29
 Devānampiyatissa (king) , Smp I 70,71

- Dhammadinna Man I 42,
Pap I 184
SV 489
Mv 32.52
- Dhammagutta J IV 490
- Dhammapāli Smp I 63
- Dhammika Tissa (king)
(see also Saddhatissa) SA Sn III 48 foll., 147
- Digha Smp I 62
- Dighakarayana (minister) Smp III 583
- Dighajantu (Damila) .. Man II 230
Pap Sn 955
- Dighasumma Smp I 62, 104
Pap Sn 1008
- Dipa (king) SV 443
- Dutthagamani Att 80
CuNI 1A/ 79
Sum VII II 640
Man II 212, 212, 379
PJ II 71
DhA IV 50
Mv. chh. 22-32

G

- Geda (of Kalyani)..... Pap I 122
- Godha Smp II 307, 430, 478, III 588
- Gonaraviya Pap II 286
- Gopaka Sivali SV 156

I

- Isidatta SV 446

J

- Jivaka Man Sn 854, 855
- Jettipala Man Sn 854, 855.

K

- Kakavanna Tissa (king) . Man II 64
Mv 22.22, foll., 23.16, 24.8 foll.
- Kala Buddharakkhita ... Pap II 293
- Kaladeva Pap I 122
- Kalasumana Smp I 62, 104
- Karavika Tissa Smp III 646, 647
Smp Sn II 208, 237
- Khema Smp I 63
- Kujjatissa Man II 247
- Kutakanna Tissa (king).. SA I 34
SV 452
Pap Sn 653
Mv 34. 28-36
Ep Zey III 156
- Kutumbiyaputta Tissa.... Man I 49

L

- Lakuntaka-Atimbara
(minister) Dha IV 50
- Lambakanna (royal family) Man II 30
Mv 35.16 foll., 36.58 foll.
- Lomasa Naga Pap I 78

M

- Mahā (thera) SV 359
Pap I 264
- Mahā Abhaya Man II 249
Smp Sn II 59
- Mahādāthika Mahānaga
(king)... Man I 22
Mv 34.68 foll.
- Mahādatta (of Ariyakotī) Pap I 160

- Mahadatta (of Hahkanaka) SV 489
 V1 II 634
 Pap I 184
- Mahadatta (of Moravāpi). Att 230, 267, 284, 286.
 Pma 405
- Mahadeva (of Bhaggira) J IV 490
- Mahadeva (of Karandakola) Man Sn 611
- Mahadeva (of Malaya) V1 I 241
- Mahāvilasamarakṣita Att 267, ~~268~~ 278,
 SV 81
 Pma 405
 J.P.T.S. 1914 p 190
- Mahagatimbayatissadatta Att 11
- Mahakumara Man I 77
 Pap II 140
- Mahamitta SV 279
 Man II 59
 Pap I 294
 SA Sn III 136
- Mahanaga Smp I 63
- Mahanaga (king) Att 399
 Smp II 473
 Ep Zey III ~~155~~, 156, 214
- Mahānaga (sub-king) ... Mv 14.56
- Mahānāga (of Bhūtarāma) Mv 36.7
- Mahanaga (of Kalavalli-
 mandapa) ... ApA 121
 Att 399
 J IV 490
 SV 352
 Pj II 56
 Sum VII I 190
 SA Sn III 155
- Mahānāga (of Piyāngu-
 dīpa) .. V1 II 706

Mahānāga (of Uccātalanka) SV 489

Mahānāga (of Vadhātala-
nagaragāma) SA II 166

Mahānigama-sāmi Smp Sn II 427

Mahāpaduma Smp I 184, 263, 283
 ,, II 368, 387, 477
 ,, III 535, 538, 556, 588, 596, 609
 644, 651, 683, 715, 719
 ,, Sn II 54, 59, 208, 282, 287, 289,
 315

Mahāpaduma (of Rohana).. Mv 35.30 foll.

Mahāpaduma (of the time
 of king Vasabha).. Smp II 471

Mahāphussa Pap I 257, II 369

Mahāphussadeva
 (of Alindaka) Pj II 55
 ApA 120
 SA Sn III 154
 Sum VII I 189

Mahārakkhita Smp III 695

Mahārchanagutta Vi I 155, II 375
 Att 187

Mahāsangharakkhita J IV 490
 Man I 40
 Pap I 66, 197
 Att 268

Mahāsena (king) Smp III 519

Mahāsiva Att 220, 266, 405
 Pap I 269, 270 , II 286
 Man Sn 525
 SA Sn III 159, 171, 198
 Smp I 63, III 711, Smp Sn II 237
 Sum VII I 222 202
 ,, II 375, 430, 511, 543, 554
 ,, III 805, 881, 883, 8892, 1013

Mahāsiva (of Bhātivānka) Mv 30.46

- Mahāsiva (of Vāmanta) ...J IV 490
- Mahāsiva (of Gamanta-
pabbhāra) Man I 40, 49
Sum VII III 727
- Mahāsiva (king) Mv 21.vv 1, 2
- Mahāsana SV 445
- Mahāsumma Snp I 263, 264
,, II 368, 387, 477
,, III 535, 538, 556, 588, 596, 609,
646, 647, 651, ~~682~~ 683, 698,
715, 719
Snp Sn II 54, 59, 208, 282, 287,
289, 315
Mv 23.60
- Mahātīpitaka Snp III 695
- Mahātissa Man I 42
- Mahātissa (of Amurārāma) Mv 36.30
- Mahātissa (Bodhinātu)...Man II 213
- Mahātissa (of Cetiya-
pabbata)..... V1 I 20, 193, 194
- Mahātissa (of Cīvara-
gumba) V1 I 43, 47
- Mahātissa (of Kalyāṇi-
gāma)Pj II 6, 7
- Mahātissa (of Kupikkala)Mv 33.49 foll., ~~83~~ 82, 95
- Mahātissa (of Mahā-
karasiṅgiya).. V1 I 292
- Mahātissa (of Maṇḍalarāma) DhA IV 51
- Mahātissa (of Punna-
vallika) Att 116
V1 I 143
Snp III 644
- Mahātissa 9 vanavāsī) Pj II 56
Pap I 258

Mahāvāsakalaka (upāsaka)	Man II 216
Mahāvyaḡga	Man II 247 Mv 32.54
Mahinda	Sup I 69 foll. ItA 259 Mv 20.30 foll.
Malimbhādeva	J IV 490 Mv 32.49
Maliyadeva	Man I 38 Pap Sn 1024
Mallaka	Vi I 265, 266
Milakha Tissa	Man I 35, 49 Pj II 236 SA I 332 , II 273
Milhābhaya	Vi I 79
Mutasiva (king)	Sup I 69

N

Nāga	Sup I 62 Vi I 96 Man Sn 670, 671
Nāga (therī)	Sum VII II 535 Man Sn 670, 671

P

Padhaniya Tissa (of Cittalapabbata)	Pap I 79
Padhaniya Tissa (of Khandasela)	Pap I 78
Padhaniya Tissa (of Nāgapabbata)	Vi 127
Pandita Tissa	Pug. Pañ. Comm. in J. P. T. S. 1914 p 223
Phussa	Sup I 63
Phussadeva	Sup I 63, 263 II 458, 495 III 651, 653, 685

Phussadeva (of Katakandhakāra)	..J IV 490
Phussamitta	Man I 53,59
Pingala Buddharakkhita	Pap I 204 Att 103 SA II 150 Pap Sn 978
Pindapātika	Man II 248
Pindapātiya (of Ambariya)	Man II 61 foll.
Pitimala	Man I 49 Pap I 234 Sum VII III 748
Pituraṇṇa (king)	SV 448 Snp II 440, 473 Mv 33.36
Puppha	Snp I 63

R

Reva (Majjhimaṇṇaka)	VI I 95
Reva (of Malaya)	VI I 95

S

Saddhātissa (king)	Man I 23, II 30, 246 foll. SA Sn III 49 Mv 33.5 foll. Also see under Dhammikatissa
Sakatatissa	Man I 77 Pap II 140
Saṅghamitta (therī)	Snp I 90 Mv 20.48 foll.
Saṅgharakkhita	Att 187
Sahaya	Snp I 63
Sirinivāsa (king)	Snp Sn II 427
Siva	Snp I 63

Tissa (Cullapindapātika)	Vi I 191 Pap II 146
Tissa (, of Gāṇḍavalla) ..	Man I 36
Tissa (, of Giri) ..	Man II 215
Tissa (of Kotapabbata)	Vi I 292 Pug. Pañ. Com. in J.P.T.S. 1914 (p 186
Tissa (of Lenagiri)	Sun VII II 534 Pap II 397 foll. Man Sn 669, 670
Tissa (Pindapātiya)	Man II 61 foll.
Tissa (, of Devaputta Mahāratta) ..	Vi I 292
Tissa (Punabbasukūṭumbikaputta) ..	SV 389
Tissabhūti (of Maṇḍalārāma)	SV 448 Man I 39 Att 30
Tissadatta	SV 275, 387, 389 Pap I 290 Man II 54 Vi II 403 Sap I 62, 104 Sap Sn II 377

U

Upali	Sap I 63
Upatissa	Sap I 63, 263, II 456 III 651, 653, 683, 714
Uttara (janapada-mamusa)	Man II 347

V

Vasabha (king)	Sap II 471 Pap Sn 869 Sun VII I 291, II 635 Mv 35.69 foll. Ep. Zey. I 66 foll., 211
Vatthabha Nigrodha	SV 449
Vatthagāmaṇi Abhaya (king)	See under Piturāja. Also Ep. Zey. I 235 foll.
Vijaya (king)	Sap I 72 Mv ehh 6, 7; Dip. 9.21
Viśākha	Vi I 312

Appendix I b

Names of Places in Ceylon (Mentioned in the Commentaries)

A

- Abhayagiri Snp III 583
Mv 33.79 foll.; 33.96 foll.;
35.120; 36.7, 33, 111, 112;
37.12 foll.; 37.212 foll.;
Mv tr. p 235 note 1
OÜl. Vol I p3 note 2
Ep.Zey. I 225, 252, 253
P.L.O.41
Beal: Travels of Buddhist Pilgrims
pp 151, 157
- Abhayavāpi Snp I 88
SA Sn III 151
Mv 17.35 foll.
Mv tr.p 74 note 3
- Adam's Peak Man II 230
Pap Sn 955
Beal: Travels of Buddhist Pilgrims
p 150
J.R.A.S. New Series Vol 15 pp 338 foll.
- Ahidīpa OpA 19
- Alajanapada SV 447
- Amahigamāx Snpixixix
- Ambalatthikā (at Lohapāsāda) Sum VII I 131, II 635
- Amakkhāx Man I 22
- Alinda ApA 120
Pj II 55
SV 352
SA Sn III 154
- Amahāgana Snp I 101
- Ambalatthikā (at Lohapāsāda) Sum VII I 131, II 635
- Amuttāx Man I 22

- Ambariya vihāra** Att 103
 Man II 61 foll.
 Pap I 204
 SA II 150
- Ambatthala** Man I 22
 Smp I 73
 Mv 34.71; 36.9, 106; 37.68, 69
 Mv tr. p 90 note 1
- Asbīlāhala vihāra** Pap Sn 1025
- Antarasamudda** Smp II 306
- Antarasebbāha** Pap Sn 1024
- Antaravaddhamana** SA II 150
- Amurādhapura** ApA I 219
 UAA 238
 SV 473
 Man II 37
 DhA I 398, IV 50
 VI I 90
 SA I 222, II 194, SA Sm Sn III 151
 J. V. 254
 Smp Sn II 178
 Sum VII II 573, 596
 Mv 7.43
 Legge: Fa Hien's Records of Buddhist
 Kingdoms p 104
- Amurādhavapi-pāli** SA Sn III 151
- Ariyakoti** Pap I 160
- Atthasatthilena** Smp I 82
 Mv 16. 12, 13, 14.

B

- Bhaggiri** J IV 490
- Bhataragāna** Pap II 399
 Man Sn 670, 671
- Bherapāsānaka vihāra** .. Man II 347
- Bhokkantaḡana** DhA IV 50

C

- Candanagāma Smp I 100
 Mv 19.54, 62
- Cetāligāma Smp I 90
- Cetavīgāma Mv 17.59
- Cetiyaṭṭhā Smp I 82-85, 100, II 306, 474
 Pap I 78, II 140, 294, 398
 Pap Sn 653, 1024
 Man I 22, 77; Man Sn 523, 670
 Vi I 20, 62, 120
 SA I 34, SA Sn III 48 foll.
 Sum VII II 535, III 1011
 Att 399
 SV 473
 Mv ch. 16; 17.9, 23; 19.62; 20.33, 45
 21.22; 34.30, 31.64, 75 foll.
 35.11, 80; 36.130
 Mv tr. p 114 note 3
- Chātapaṭṭhā Smp I 74
 Man I 26
- Cittaṭṭhā Att 350
 CuN1A 54
 SV 264, 445, 489, 498
 Pap I 22, 79, 185, 275; II 91
 Pap Sn 1024, 1025
 Vi I 120, 127, 173, 292, 306, 313, II 634
 Man I 37, 44; II 250
 Smp III 680, 681
 SA II 166, 252
 Sum VII III 774, 994
 Mv 22.23; 24.9
 Mv tr. p 148 note 2
- Cīvaraṅgama Vi I 43
- Corakamāhavihāra Vi I 38
- Coriyassara SV 447
- Cūlaṅganiya Man II 212
- Cūlaṅganiyapitthi Mv 24.19; Mv tr. p 165 note 5

Oḷlanagallana V1 I 127

D

Dakkhina-vihara Man II 172
Mv 33x 33.88; 35.5; 36.12, 13, 35, 107

Dakkhinagiri-vihāra .. Pap II 293
V1 I 120
Mv 33.8, 98

Dakkhina-Malaya-janapada Man I 92.

Devaputta Mahārattha ... V1 I 292

Dighavāpi cetiya Snp I 89
SA I 341
Mv 33x213 1.79

Dighavāpi-rattha DhA IV 50

Dighavāpi-vihāra Pap Sn 1024
Mv 33.10

Dighavāpi Man II 249
Pap Sn 1024 830
Mv 24.2

Dibba-vihāra SV 342

Dīpa-vihāra Man II 133; Man Sn 831
Pap I 155

Donuppalavāpi gāma Pug. Pañ. Com. in J. P. T. S. 1914 p 184

Dvāramandālā Snp I 90
Mv 17.59; 23.24
Mv p tr. p 68 note 1

G

Gaggaraṇḍaliya-aṅgana.... Pap I 234

Galambatittha-vihāra ... ApA 121
SV 332 353
Pj II 57
Mv 35. 85-86

Gāṇḍiavāla-vihāra Pap Sn 1024
Man I 35 foll.

Gāma Att 31

Gavaravala-aṅgaṇa	Man II 248
Gaviḷḷaṅgaṇa	Pap Sn 758
Girigāma	ApA 128 CuN1A 78 Pap II 144 P ₂ II 70
Girigāmakanna	SV 452
Girikanda vihāra	Att 116 Vi I 143
Girikanda mountain	Mv 10.28
Giri vihāra	Man II 215 Sum VII II 514
Gotasamudda	Sum VII II 695
Guttasālagāma	Att 398

H

Haṅkasaṇa(ka)	Vi II 634 Pap I 184
Haṭṭhibhoga janapada ...	Pap II 377 Mv 35.44
Haṭṭhikucchi pabbhāra	Vi I 110
Haṭṭhikucchi vihāra	Vi I 120

I

Iśarasamāna vihāra	Sup I 100 Mv 19.61; 20.14; 35.47; 36.36 ^A
-------------------------	---

J

Jaggaraṇadi	SV 447
Jambukola	Sup I 98, 100; Sup Sn II 377 SV 389, 446 Sum VII II 695 Mv 11.23; 18.7; 19.28, 60
Jambukola cetiya	Sup Sn II 377

K

Kabupelanda vihāra	SV 294
--------------------------	--------

- Kacchaka-tittha Man II 216
Mv 23x 23.17; 25.12
Mv tr. p 72 note 2
- Kacchaka-daha SV 352
- Kadamba River SA I 34, 222
Pap Sn 653
P.L.O. 27
Mv tr. p 58 note 3
- Kājaragāma Smp I 100
Man I 37
Mv 19.534. 62
Mv tr. p 132 note 1
Ep Zey III 212 foll.
- Kalakaocchagāma
(in Kalyani)..... Pap Sn 1025
- Kaladighavāpīgāma
(in Kalyani)..... ApA 128
GuMIA 78
Man I 23
Pap II 144
- Kalamba-nadī See under Kadamba River
- Kalamba-tittha SA Sn III 155
- Kāladighagāma Pj II 70
- Kalavallimandapa ApA 121
Att 399
SV 352
J IV 490
Pj II 56
Pap I 258
SA Sn III 155
- Kālagāma Pj II 30
- Kālakagāma SV 448
- Kallagāma Man I 38, 92
- Kallavālagāma..... Thera A II 94
Man I 160
- Kallaka-mahāvihāra DhA IV 51
- Kalumbara Man II 250

- Kalyāni Pap Sn 1025
 SV 295, 296
 J II 128
 SA II 230
 PJ II 6.7
 V1 II 689
 MV 1.63 foll.; 1.74 foll.; 22.13 foll.
- Kalyāni vihāra ApA 128
 OuN1A 78
 Smp I 89
 PJ II 70
 MV 32.51; 36.17, 34
- Kalyaninadi-mukhadvāra .. Pap Sn 1008
- Kanikārapadhānaghara ... Pap I 78
- Kanikāravālika-samūda
 vihāra Man I 77
 Pap II 140
- Kantaka cetiya Smp I 82
 MV 16. 12, 13
- Kanhanaka SV 49 489
- Karandakola Man Sn 611
- Karadīpa Ap CpA 19
- Kāraliyagiri V1 I 96
- Kassakalena SV 279
 SA Sn III 136
 Man II 59
 Pap I 294
- Katakandhakāra J IV 490
 Smp Sn II 376
 V1 I 228
- Khandacela vi^rhā^{ka} Pap I 78
- Kilāṇḍjakāsanasāladvāra Pap I 234
- Kolita vihāra Man II 173
- Korandaka vihāra V1 I 91

Kotapabbata vihāra V1 I 292
 DhA IV 50
 Pug.Paṇ. Com. in J.P.T.S. 1914 p 186
 Mv 22.25; 23. 55 foll.

^{tuva}
 Kutalinahavihara SV 293
 Pap Sn 699

Kumbhakaragāna V1 I 91

Kupuvana vihāra Pap Sn 700

Kurandakā/Janabālena ... V1 I 38

Kurundaka Man I 53, 59

Kuruvaka-tittha Pap Sn 1025

Kutinbiya vihāra Man II 30

Kutali vihāra Pap Sn 1024
 Mv 22.23

L

Lenagiri Pap II 397
 Sum V11 II 534

Licchikali SA II 230

Lohapāsāda Att 31
 UdA 101
 V1 I 97 91, 97
 DhA III 472, IV 74
 Man I 23, II 247
 Snp I 101, Snp Sn II 120
 SA I 74, II 276
 Sum V11 I 131, II 581, 635
 Pap II 185, Pap Sn 1024
 Mv 15.205; ah.27; 32.9; 33.6, 7, 30
 34.39; 35.3; 36.25, 52, 102, 124;
 37.11, 62;
 Mv tr. p 112 note 5
 Oul tr. p 3 note 1

Lokandara vihāra Pap Sn 1024

Lokantara vihāra Snp Sn II 377

H

- Madhuangana-gāma** Man II 215
- Mahabodhi** Smp I 89
SV 449, 451
- Mahābodhi-aṅgana** Smp Sn II 120
- Mahabodhi-dvārakotthaka** Sum VII III 1011
Man Sn 523
- Mahācetiya** Pap I 264, II 145, 403
Pap Sn 698 foll., 882, 955
Smp I 89, 92, 101
Smp Sn II 120, 377
Sum VII II 578, 611, III 899
Man I 27, II 5, 214, 231
Man Sn 811
VI I 143
SV 292, 293, 446, 449, 451
SA Sn III 159
CuṇiA 108
Mv 1.82; 15. 51 foll.; 20.43; ch.28;
32.3 foll.; 32.8; 33x3;
33.5, 22, 23, 31; 34.39 foll, 60 foll;
34.70; 35.2, 17, 80
36.24, 65 foll., 126.
- Mahāgāma** Man I 40 II 60 foll., 63, 249
Pap I 79, Pap Sn 820
Sum VII II 695
Mv 22.8 foll, 24.1
Mv tr. p 146 note 5
,, p 164 note 3
- Mahāgīrigāma** Pap II 397
- Mahākarañjiya vihāra** ... VI I 292
- Mahākhiragāma** Man Sn 669
- Mahāmaṇḍapa** Pap Sn 1024
- Mahāmuni-gāma**..... DhA IV 50
- Mahānāgavana** Smp I 83
Mv 1.21, 22
- Mahāpunnagāma** DhA IV 50

- Mahātitttha** SV 448
 Snp Sn II 46
 Mv tr. p 60 note 1
 Ep Zey III 135
- Mahāvihāra** ApA 128
 DhA IV 74
 Pap I 1, 197 foot note, 234
 ,, II 297, Pap Sn 869, 1030
 Kv 1
 Att 2
 UdA 2
 J I 1, 85
 V1 I 2, 96, 312
 Pj II 71
 CuN1A 108
 Sum V11 II 578, 611
 ,, III 748, 1011
 SV 292, 446, 449, 451
 SA Sn III 151
 Snp II 307, III 583, Snp Sn II 314
 Mv. 20.38; 33.97; 35.65, 88;
 36.2, 10 foll., 32, 74, 105;
 37.3 foll., 54 foll., 85, 232 foll.;
 Mv tr. p 77 note 1
 ,, p 99 note 4
 ,, p 113 note 8
 Beal: Fa Hien p 159
- Mahindaguhā** V1 I 110
 Mv 20.16
- Malaya** Man I 40
 V1 I 241
 SV 224
 Mv 7.68; 24.7; 37.6 *f-a*
 Lv tr. p 60 note 4
- Mālārāma** *vihāra* SV 452
- Mandalārāma** Att 30
 SV 448
 DhA IV 51
 Man I 38, 92
 Pap I 66
- Mangana** Man II 247
 Mv 32.53
- Manikulakārāma vihāra** ... BA Sn III 15

- Mariāvattī** ApA 128
CuNIA 79
Pj II 71
Pap II 145
Mv 26.8 foll.; 35.121; 36.33,36,107
- Meghavāra** Snp I 81
- Mihintale** See under Cetiyapabbata, and also
I.H.Q. II No 1 p 10
Beal : Fa Hien p 158
Hasting's Ency. of Religion and
Ethics Vol III p 332
Mv tr. p 89 note 3
- Missakapabbata** Snp I 73
Mv tr. p 89.note 3
- Moravāpi** Att 230, 267, 284, 286.
Psma 405
- Mūluppālāvāpi vihāra** ... Pap II 385
- Mutingana**..... Snp I 89
Pap Sn 1024
- N
- Nāgadīpa** Man II 311; Man Sn 669
CpA 19
Pap II 398
Sum Vil II 534, III 899
SA II 230
J II 128, III 187, IV 238
SV 433, 444, 446, 457
Mv 1.47,54; 20.25; 35.124; § 36.9
Mv tr. p 6 note 2
- Nāgahavihāra (in Kalyani)** Pap Sn 1025
- Nāgahavihāra (in Rohana)** SV 407
Mv 22.9; 35.29
Mv tr. p 147 note 1
- Nāgapabbata** Vi I 127
- Nakulanagara** Att 399
- Nānasmukha**..... SA II 230
- Nandānavana** Snp I 81, 82
Mv 15.202; Mv tr. p 77 note 1

Ninkapornapadhānaghara.. SV 489

P

Paeoli vihāra Pap Sn 887

Pācīnagaraka vihāraPap Sn 1024

Pācīnakhandarājī Sum Vil III 1010
Man Sn 523
Vi I 90, 91

Padhanaghara Pap I 78

Paheciivatthu Smp I 86

PācīcaggalalenaApA 128
CuM1A 78
Pj II 70
Pap II 144

PācīcamahāvihāraSmp II 306
P.L.C. 56

PācīcanikāyamandalaVi I 96
Sum Vil II 581
Pap I 197 foot note 1

Pāngura vihāra Pap II 377

Paṭṭhambāṅgana Sum Vil III 1011

Paṭṭhanandapatthana SA Sn III 151

Pathanacekkhīrtiya Smp I 79, 100
Mv 19.61.
Mv tr. 95.note 2

Pennamāna Man Sn 524

Penambāṅgana Att 399

Pipphali vihāraSV 439

Piyāṅgudīpa Vi II 706
Sum Vil II 648
Mv 24.25; 25.104; 32.52
Mv tr. p 166 note 4

Piyāṅguguhā Pap I 78

Piyāṅguparivāṇa SV 292

Potaliya vihāra Man II 173

Punnavallika Att 116
 VI I 143
 Smp III 644

R

Rājanātu vihāra SA I 222

Rājayatana cetiya Sum Vil III 8899

Rohana Sum Vil II 695
 SV 407
 Smp I 100
 Man I 35, II 30, 347
 VI I 91, 96
 Hv 22.6; 23.13; 37.6 foll.
 I.H.Q. Vol II No 1 p 12
 P.L.O. 32

S

Sakiyavamsa vihāra Pap Sn 1024

Samuddagiri vihāra SA Sn III 15

Setambangana Att 399 (foot note 4)

Silācetiya Man II 247
 Hv tr. 1.83 Hv tr. p 9 note 3

Sirisavatthu J II 127, 128
 Hv 7.32

Sīhaladīpa ApA 119
 CuEIA 78
 Sum Vil I 188
 Pap I 203, 257
 SA II 150
 Pj II 30, 53, 55, 57, 70
 Pj II (2) 397

Sonagiripāda SV 439
 Man II 17
 Pap Sn 887

Sudhāmundaika Man I 26

Sumanagiri vihāra Man II 230
 Pap Sn 955

T

- Talaṅgara SV 389, 489
 Man I 42
 V1 II ~~392~~x 392, 634
 Mv 32.52
- Talaṅgaratissaṃpabbata .. Pap I 184
- Tālapitthika vihara..... SV 156
- Tālavellimaggā V1 I 63
- Tambapaṇṇidīpa Pap I 234, II 293, 295
 Pap Sn 882, 920, 978
 Smp I 69, Smp Sn II 261
 J I 85, II 127, IV 490
 V1 I 36, 312, II 392, 393
 SA II 111
 Kv 59
 Man II 37, Man Sn 607
 Sum V11 II 433
 Mv 6.47; 7.39
- Tambapaṇṇisara J II 129
- Tattakasa^ola parivēpa ... Man II 30
- Therambattha lēna Att 187
- Therambatthala..... V1 I 155, II 375
- Thūparāma Smp I 86, 87, 89, 92, 100
 Smp Sn II 120
 J V 254
 SV 449, 451
 V1 I 91
 Man II 247
 SA I 222, SA Sn III 151
 Udā 238
 Pap Sn 713
 Sum V11 II 611, 612
 Mv 15.192; 17.30, 50, 64; 19.61
 20.52; 23.33-23, 24; 35.3, 80, 87, 91
 36.4, 106, 107, 114, 128, 129
 37.28, 207.
 Mv tr. p 118 note 2
 Sp.Zey. I 208
- Tissamahārāma Man I 40, 42, II 61, 249
 Pap Z I 184, II 91, Pap Sn 1025
 V1 II 392

DhA IV 51
 SV 445
 Sum VII II 581
 Hv 20.25; 22.3; 24.13; 25.2 foll.
 Hv tr. p 138 ~~note~~ note 3

Tivakkabrahmanagāma.... Sap 128 I 100
 Hv 19.37 foll.; 19.61

Tissattherasētiya Pap II 92

Tuladhara pabbata V1 I 96
 Hv 23.90; 35.30

U

Uccatalaṅka SV 489

Uccavālika V1 II 634

Ullabbhakolakannika Man II 249

Uppalavapi SV 452

Upārimandala J IV 490

Uttamadevi vihāra Pap II 297

Uttaregāma Pap Sn 978

Uttaravaddhamāna Att 103
 Pap I 204

V

Vadhatalanagaragāna SA II 166

Vajagaragiri vihāra ... Pap I 122

Valliyavithi..... Man II 63

Vālika vihāra SV 389

Vāmantapabbhāra J IV 490

Vātakapabbata vihāra ... Pap Sn 1024

Vātakasitapabbata vihāra Pap II 294

Vattakālakagāma Att 116
 V1 I 143

Vemu nadi SV 446

Appendix II a

Quotations from the Purāṇas.

(Verse)

1. Attani hitanajjhatte ahite ca satubbidhe
 Yadā passati ^{an} nāttam sakam ci tam nibandhati.

(1) Vi. I. 307

2. Adhimokkhe ca paggahe upatthāne ca kampati
 Upekkhāvajjanāya ca upekkhāya nikantiyā.

(1) Vi. II. 637

(2) SA. II. 201 (Not as Purāṇa)

3. nāgate pi saṃsāre appavatte na dissati
 Eva ^{attham aṅkāya} ~~attham aṅkāya~~ titthiya assaṃ vasi.

(1) Vi. II. 602

4. nnaṃ paṇaṃ khādaniyaṃ bhojanaṃ ca mahārahaṃ
 Ekadvāreṇa pavisitvā navadvārehi sandati.

(1) Vi. I. 346

5. Annam paṇam khādaniyaṃ bhojanaṃ ca mahārahaṃ
 Ekaratti parivāsaṃ sabbam bhavati pūtikam.

(1) Vi. I. 346

6. Annam paṇam khādaniyaṃ bhojanaṃ ca mahārahaṃ
 Bhujjati abhinandanto nikkhā^mmento jigucchati.

(1) Vi. I. 346.

7. Annam paṇam khādaniyaṃ bhojanaṃ ca mahārahaṃ
 Bhujjati saparivāse nikkhāmento niliyati.

(1) Vi. I. 346.

8. Ayam kammabhūmi idha maggabhūvanā

Thānāni saṁvejaniyā bahū idha

Samvega saṁvejaniyesu vatthusu

Samvega jāto va payuñja yoniso. (1) SA Sn III.31

9. Asīti pada saḥassāni tathānava satāni ca

Anusandhi nayā ete Majjhimaṣṣa pakāsitā.

(1) Pap I.2

10. Ādānanikkhepanato vayo vuddhatthagāmito

Ahārato ca ututo kammato cāpi cittato

Dhammatārūpato satta vitthārena vipassati.

(1) Vi. II. 618

11. Imāni aṭṭhaggunāni uttamāni

Diṣvā tahiṃ sammāsati punappunam

Ādittacelassirasaṁpāmo muni

Ehaṅgānupassī amatassa paṭṭiyā.

(1) Vi. II. 641

12. Ete nāga mahapaṇṇā vidayassu maggakovidā

Vinayaṃ dīpe pakāsesun Piṭakam Tambapaṇṇiyā.

(1) Smp I. 62

13. -vaṃ-kamme-vipāka-vipāka-

Evam kamme vipāke ca vattamāne sahetuke

Bijarukkhādikānam va pubba koṭṭi na paṭṭhāyati

(1) Vi II. 602

14. Evam etam abhiññāya bhikkhu Buddhassa sāvako

Gambhīram nipunam sūññaṃ paccayaṃ paṭivijjhati.

(1) Vi II. 603

15. Evam evam akusala andhabala puthujjana

Pañca ganhant' anattāni bhava jātabhinanditā.

(1) SA Sn III.41

16. Obhase ceva fiāne ca pītiyā ca vikampati

Passaddhiyā sukhe ceva yehi cittam pavedhati.

(1) Vi II.637 (2)-

(2) SA II.201 (Not as Porāṇa)

17. Kamma natthi vipakamhi pāke kamma na vijjati

Aññañ añña ubho suñña na ca kamma vinnā phalaṃ.

(1) Vi II.603

18. Kammaṃsa karako natthi vipakassa ca vedako

Suddha dhammā pavattanti evetaṃ sammadassanaṃ.

(1) Vi II.602

19. Kāmesu chandam patigham vinodaye

Uddhacca middham vicikicchā pañcamam

Vivekapaññojjakareṇa cetasā

Rāja va suddhanta gato tahiṃ rama. (1) Vi I.152

(2) Pama 163

20. Kalāvakaṇi ca gaṇgeyyam paṇḍaram tamba piṅgalam

Gandha māṅgaḥa hemaṇi ca upasatha chaddaṇṇa' ime dāsa.

(1) Pama 451

(2) SV 397

(3) Pap II.25

(4) SA II.43

(5) CuN1A 37

21. Khandhā nirujjhanti na ca c'atthi añño

Khandhanam bhedo maraṇanti vuccati

Tesaṃ khayam passati appamatto

Manis va vijjham vajireṇa yoniso.

(1) Vi II.644

(2) Pama 183

22. Gantvāna maṇḍalamālaṃ nāgavikkanta cāriko

Obhāsayanto lokaggo nisīdi varamaṇaṇe.

(1) UDA 41⁵. (2) SA Sn III.66

23. Gantvāna se satta padāni Gotama

Diṣvā vilokesi sama samantato

Atthaṅgupetaṃ giram abbhudīrayi

Sīhe yathā pabbatāya uddhāni thito.

(1) Sum VII.1.61 (2) PMA 145
(3) Man I.105 (4) BuA 14 (Not
(5) Pap I.46-47 as Porāṇa)
(6) MNIA 127

24. Cattalīse vāpādanāni catu vaggāni yassa ca

Idaṃ therī'padānaṃ ti catuttham amulomato.

(1) ĀPA 84-85

25. Cittāni saṅkiltthāni saṅkilissanti mānava.

Citto muddhe visuḷḷhanti itti vuttam mahesina.

(1) SA II.327 (2) ItA 213

26. Culadevo ca medhāvī vināye ca visārado

Sivattthero ca medhāvī vināye sabbattha kovido.

(1) Smp I.63

27. Culabhayo ca medhāvī vināye ca visārado

Tissattthero ca medhāvī saddhamma vāṇsa kovido.

(1) Smp I.63

28. Jalanto dīpa rukkho va pabbat'agge yathā sikhī

Devānaṃ paricchatte va sabba phulle virocati.

(1) UDA 416 (2) SA Sn III.66

29. Nāṭaṇi ca nāṭaṇi ca ubho vipassati.

(1) V1 II.642 (2) PMA 182

30. Tato Arittho medhavi Tissadatto ca pandito
Visārado Kalasumano thero ca Dīgha nāmaḥ.

(1) Smp. I. 62

31. Tato paṇanake ramme parayana saṃsāraṃ
Anantaṃ paṇayī Buddhā cūḍasa paṇa kotiyaḥ.

(1) Pj II (2). 604
(2) CuN1A 59

32. Tato Mahinda Itthiya Uttiya Sambalo pi ca
Bhadda nāma ca pandito
Ete nāga mahāpaṇḍita Jambudīpa idhāgataḥ.

(1) Smp I. 62

33. Tathā na anto kammaṣṣa vipako upalabbhati
Bahiddhā pi na kammaṣṣa na kammaṣṣa tattha vijjati.

(1) Vi II. 603

34. Tassa sissa mahāpaṇḍita Puppā nāma bahussuto
Sāsanam amurakkhanto Jambudīpe patitthito.

(1) Smp II 63

35. Tahiṃ nisīṇṇo varadamaśārathī
Devatidevo sata pūṇa lakkhano
Buddhasāno majjhagato virocati
Suvanna nikkham viya paṇḍukambale.

(1) UdA 416 (2) SA Sn III. 66

36. Tīṇi sandhi sahasāni tathā nava satāni ca
Anusandhi naya ete Majjhimaṣṣa pakasita. (1) Pap I. 2

37. Dīṭṭhi bandhana bandhā te tanhā sotena vuyhara
Tanhā sotena vuyhantā na te dukkhā paṇuocare (1) Vi II 603

38. Dighasumano ca paḍḍito punareva Kalasumano

Nagatthero ca Baddharakkhito

Tissatthero ca medhavi Devatthero ca paṇḍito.

(1) Smp. I. 62

39. Dipe tāraṇa rāja va paṇḍaya atirocatha

Upatisso ca medhavi Phussadevo mahākathī

(1) Smp. I. 63

40. Duggandham asuṇim vyādhim jaram maraṇa pañicaman

Anatthaṃ honti pañic'ete miha litte bhujāgama bhavantare.

(1) SA Sn III. 41

41. Duggandham asuṇim byādhim viṣam maraṇa pañicaman

Anatthaṃ honti pañic'ete miha litte bhujāgama.

(1) SA Sn III. 41.

42. Dvāre caranti kammāni na dvāradvāre oṇṇino

Tasmā dvārehi kammāni aññam aññam vavatthita.

(1) Att 84

43. Dve asāṇṭi sahaṇṇāni ajjhogaṇho mahannave

Accuggato tāvadeva oakkavalāṇa siluccayo

Parikkhipitvā taṃ sabbaṃ lokadhātumayaṃ thito.

(1) Vi I 206 (2) CuṇiA 30.

44. Dhammapāli nāmo ca Rohaṇe sādhu pūjito

Tassa siṃso mahāpaṇḍo Khema nāmo tipetako.

(1) Smp I 63

45. Na kāyato jāyare phassa pañcamā
 Na phassato no ca ubhinnaṃ antara
 Hetuṃ pañca pabhavanti saṅkhata
 Yathā pi saddo pahatāya bheriyā. (1)V1 II 596

46. Na ghānato jāyare phassa pañcamā
 Na saddato no ca ubhinnaṃ antara
 Hetuṃ pañca pabhavanti saṅkhata
 Yathā pi saddo pahatāya bheriyā. (1)V1 II 595

47. Na cakkhuto jāyare phassa pañcamā
 Na rūpato no ca ubhinnaṃ antara
 Hetuṃ pañca pabhavanti saṅkhata
 Yathā pi saddo pahatāya bheriyā. (1)V1 II 595

48. Na jivhato jāyare phassa pañcamā
 Na rasato no ca ubhinnaṃ antara
 Hetuṃ pañca pabhavanti saṅkhata
 Yathā pi saddo pahatāya bheriyā. (1)V1 II 595

49. Na nikāmalābhī mettāya kusalī ti pavuccati
 Yadā catasso sīmāyo sambhinnaṃ honti bhikkhuno.
 (1)V1 I 307

50. Na vatthurūpa pabhavanti saṅkhata
 Na cāpi dhammāyatanehi niggata
 Hetuṃ pañca pabhavanti saṅkhata
 Yathā pi saddo pahatāya bheriyā. (1)V1 II 596

51. Na sotato jāyare phassa pañcama
 Na saddato no ca ubhinnaṃ antara
 Hetum pañca pabhavanti saṅkhata
 Yathā pi saddo pahatāya bheriyā. (1)V1 II 595.
52. Na h'ettha devo brahmā vā saṃsāraṃ 'atthi karako
 Suddha dhammā pavattanti hetu saṃbhāra paccaya.
 (1)V1 II 603
53. Nāmaṃ ca rūpaṃ ca idh'atthi saccato
 Na h'ettha satto manuṃso ca vijjati
 Suddhaṃ idam yantaṃ ivābhisaṅkhataṃ
 Dukkhasa puñño tiṇakaṭṭhasādiso. (1)V1 II 595
54. Nikkham jambonadass'eva nikkhittam paṇḍukambale
 Virocati vītamalo maṇi verocano yathā.
 (1)UdA 416 (2) SA Sn III.66
55. Nimitte thapayam cittaṃ nanākāraṃ vibhavayan
 Dhīro assāsapassāso sakaṃ cittaṃ nibandhati.
 (1)V1 I.286 (2) Pama 344
 (3) Snp II 428
56. Pañcasata dasāpadānāni ekapaññāsa vaggato
 Idam therāpadānaṃ ti tatiyaṃ anulomato. (1) ApA 84
57. Pañc'eva apadānāni pañca suttāni yassa ca
 Idam paccakabuddhāpadānaṃ ti dutiyaṃ anulomato.
 (1) ApA 84
58. aṇṇo'eva apadānāni pañca suttāni yassa ca
 Idam buddhāpadānaṃ ti pathamaṃ anulomato. (1) ApA 84

59. Palina Jambudipato hamsarāja va ambare

Evam uppatita therā nipatimsu naguttame. (1)Smp I 71.

60. Pātali simballi jambu devānam paricchattako

Kadāmo kapparukkho ca sirīsena bhavati sattama.

(1) V1 I 206 (2)CuN1A 30.

61. Punareva Upālī medhāvī vinaye ca visārado

Mahanāgo mahāpāṇḍito saddhamma vamsa kovido. (1)Smp I 63.

62. Punareva Bahayo medhāvī pitake sabbattha kovido

Tissa therō ca medhāvī vinaye ca visārado. (1)Smp I 63

63. Punareva Sumano medhāvī Phussa nāmo bahussuto

Mahākathī Mahāsivo pitake sabbattha kovido. (1)Smp I 63

64. Punareva Sumano medhāvī vinaye ca visārado

Bahussuto Cūlanāgo gajo va duppadhamāsiyo. (1)Smp I 62.

65. Purato purasetthassa pabbate megha sannibhe

Patitthahimsu kūtānhi hamsā va nagan uddhani. (1)Smp I 71

66. Phalena sūṭṭham tam kammaṃ phalam kammaṃ vijjati

Kammaṃ ca kho upādāya tato nibbattate phalam. (1)V1 I 603

67. Bhagavā ti vacanam settham bhagavā ti vacanam uttamam

Garugāravayutto so bhagavā tena vuccati.

(1)V1 I 209

(3)PmaA 367

(5)UdA 23

(7)Pap I 10

(9)Smp I 122

(11)SA I 12

(2)Sum V11 I 34

(4)BuA 31

(6)Man I.14

(8)MN1A 186

(10)ItA 3.

(12)Pj I 107 (not
as Perāṇā)

68. Mahāsālo va samphullo Meru rāja va alaṅkato
Suvanna rūpa saṅkāso padumo kokāsako yathā.

(1) Uda 416 (2) SA Sn III 66.

69. Mahinda nāma nāmena saṅghatthero tado ahu
Iddhiyo Vuttiyo thero Bhaddasālo ca Sambalo.

(1) Smp I 70.

70. Muhuttajāto va gavampatī yathā
Sasehi padehi phusī vasundharā
So vikkamī satta padāni Gotamo.
Setan ca chattaṇṇa anudhārayun marū.

(1) Sum VII I 61. (2) PsaA 145
(3) Man I 105 (4) Pap I 46
(5) MN1A 127 (6) BuA 14 (not as
Porāṇa)

71. Yam passati tan na dīṭṭham
Yam dīṭṭham tam na passati
Apassayan bajjhate mulho

Bajjhamāno na mucati. (1) Sum VII 757 (2) PsaA 122
(3) NA 81 (4) Pap I 242
(5) MN1A 32

72. Yathā thambhō nibandheyya vacchaṇa dāman nare idha

Bandheyyevaṇa sakaṇa cittaṇa satiyārammaṇa dāhaṇa.

(1) Vi I 269 (2) Sum VII III 763
(3) PsaA 335 (4) Pap I 247
(5) Smp II 406

73. Yathā na suriye aggi na manimhi na gomaṇe

Na tesan bahiso atthi sambhārehi ca jayati.

(1) Vi II 603.

74. Yathā pi dīpiko nāma niliyitvā gaṇhatī mige
 Taṃth'evayaṃ buddhaputto yuttayogo vipassako
 Araññiṃ pavasiṭvāna gaṇhatī phalaṃ uttamaṃ.

(1) Vi I 270 (2) Sum VII III 764
 (3) Fmā 336 (4) Pap I 248
 (5) Snp II 407

75. Yamakaṃ nāma rūpaṃ ca ubho aññōññānissita
 Ekasmiṃ bhijjamaṇassmiṃ ubho bhijjanti paccaya.

(1) Vi II 595

76. Ye keci sappam gaṇhanti miḥhalittam mahaviṇṇaṃ
 Pañca gaṇhant'anatthaya loke sappabhinandino.

(1) SA Sn III 41

77. Rūpaṃhi saṅkilittamaṃhi saṅkilissanti māṇva^a
 Rūpe suddhe visujjhanti anakkhātaṃ mahesina.

(1) SA Sn II 327 (2) Itā 215

78. Vatthum kalaṃ ca deṣaṃ ca aggaṃ paribhoga pañcaṇaṃ
 Tulayitvā pañca thānāni dhāreyy'attham vicakkhano.

(1) Snp II 305

79. Vinayaṃ te vācayissaṃ pitakaṃ Tambapaṇṇiya
 Nikāye pañca vācesuṃ satta c'eva pakarane.

(1) Snp I 62

80. Vedisagiriṃhi Rājagahe vasiṭvā timsa rattiyo

Kalo ca gamanassa ti gacchāmi dīpaṃ uttamaṃ. (1) Snp I 71

81. Saṅgamaṃ tuma idha maggabhāvaṃ

Thānāni saṃvejaniyaṇi'dha bahu

Saṃvega saṃyojaniyesu vatthusu

Saṃvega jāto va payujja yoniso.

(1) SA II 400.

82. Samvijjamañamhi visuddhadassano
 Tadyanvayan neti atit'anāgata
 Sabbe pi saṅkhāragatā palokino
 Ussava bindu suriye va uggata. (1)V1 II 643 (2)PamA 183
83. Saccaṃ satto patisañhi paccayakāraṃ eva ca
 Duddasa caturō dhammā desetuṃ ca sudukkaraṃ.
 (1)V1 II 522 (2)SV 130
84. Satta saññaṃ gahetvāna sassaṭ'uocheda dassino
 Dvāsattāhi ditthiṃ gahanti aññaṃ añña virodhita.
 (1)V1 II 603
85. Samanānaṃ hi paśādo na visamañam (1)V1 II 307 445
86. Saman pharati mettāya sabbam lokam sadevakam
 Mahāviśeso purimena yassa siṃha na paññāyati. (1)V1 I 307
87. Samanero ca Sumano^c āhalabhiñño mahiddhiko
 Bhaṇḍuko sattamo tesam ditthasacco upāsako
 Iti ete mahānaga mantayimṣu rahogata. (1)Smp I 71
88. Saraddhe kaye citte ca adhimattam pavattati
 Asaraddhamhi kayamhi sukhumaṃ sampavattati. (1)V1 I 275
 (2)PamA 339
 (3)Smp II 412
89. Silaṃ yogissa alaṅkāro silaṃ yogissa maṇḍanam
 Silaṃ alaṅkata yogi maṇḍane aggaṭṭam gato. (1)SumVil I 55.
90. Subhāsitaṃ sutva mano pasidati
 Sameti naṃ pīti sukham ca vindati
 Tassa ārammaṇe tiṭṭhati mano
 Gono va kiṭṭhāḍako dandatajjito. (1)SA Sn III 78.

Appendix II b

Quotations from the Purāṇas.

(Prone)

91. Agubhaṅhi agubhanimittam asubharammapo pi dhammo
asubbanimittam. 1. (1) Man I 46

92. Idam saṅkhārupekkhā nānam ekam eva tīni nānāni
labhati. Hetthā muḍḍitukanyata nānam nāma jātam, majjhe pati-
saṅkhārupassana nāma, ante ca sikkhappattam saṅkhārupekkhā
nānam nāma. 2. (g1)V1 II 660

93. Idam hi suttaṃ (= Anumānasuttaṃ) bhikkhu-
patimokkhaṇa nama. 3. (1) Pap II 67.

94. Obhāṣagatam cittaṃ avajjāndhakāre na iñjati ti
āneñjan ti rūpavacara catuttha jhānam eva ca rūpavirāgabhāvanā-
vasena pavattitam ārammanavibhāgena catubbidham arūpavacara-
jjhānam ti etesam pañcannam jhānanam āneñjavoharo tesu yaṃ
kiñci pādaṃ katva samāpanna arahattaphala samāpatti āneñja-
samādhi ti.4. (1)UdA 23

95. Cakkhu rūpaṃ na passati acittakatta, cittaṃ na passati acakkhukatta, dāvarāmunanasaṅghatthe pana cakkhupasāda-vatthukena cittena passati. Idha pañ'esa dhanuṇa vijjhati ti ādisu viya sasambhārakatthā nama hoti. Tasma cakkhuvijñānena rūpaṃ dāsa ti ayaṃ ev'ettha attho te ti. 5.

(1)V1 I 20

(2)Att 400

(3) MN 1A 277

96. Tasmāpi samaye ti vā tena samayena ti vā ekaṃ samayan ti vā abhilāpamatta bhedo esa niddeso, sabbattha bhummaṃ eva attho. Tasmā ekaṃ samayaṃ ti vutte pi ekasmiṃ samaye ti attho veditabbo. 2.6. (1)Uda 23 (2)Man I 13 (3)Pap I 10
97. Tesu bhūṃisu aśamugghāṭita kilesā bhūmi-laddhuppanna ti saṅkham gaṇhanti. 2.7. (1)SV 299
98. Dassanaṃaggo sammāditthi, abhiniropanaṃaggo sammā-saṅkappope. .. avikkhepaṃaggo sammāsamaḍhi. 2.8. (1)Pap I 105
99. Na macchanamaṃsaṃ ti akhādiyaṃaṃaṃ macchanamaṃsaṃ na soḍheti, tathā aṇṇasaṅkattā. 2.9. (1)Pj II 291
100. Pokkharāṃ ti sarīraṃ vadanti, vannaṃ vannaṃ eva ti. 2.10. (1)Sum VII I 282
101. Bārāpaṇi raṃṇo kira aggaṇaḥesiya kucchimhi 2.11. (1)Pj I 158 (2)Pj II 278.
102. Bhayaṭupatṭhānaṃ ekaṃ eva tīṇi nāmaṇi labhati. Sabba saṅkhāre bhayaṭo addasaṃ ti bhayaṭupatṭhānaṃ nāma jātaṃ, tesu yeva saṅkhāresu ādinavaṃ uppadesi ti ādinavānupassanaṃ nāma jātaṃ, tesu yeva saṅkhāresu nibbindamaṇaṃ uppannaṃ ti nibbindānupassanaṃ nāma jātaṃ. 2.12. (1)Vi II 651
103. Macchariyaṃ ti parehi sādharanabhāvaṃsa aśa-hanata. Tenā Ten'ev'assa Porāṇā evaṃ vacanattamaṃ vadanti : Idāṃ macchariyaṃ mayhaṃ eva hotu ti-pavattatta mā aḍḍhesaṃ

acchariyaṃ hotu ti pavattantaṃ macchariyaṃ ti vuccati ti. 14. 13.

(1)Sum VII II 491.

104. Mana ussannatāya samussā . 14.

(1)Pj I 123

105. Yathā padīpo apubbam acariṃam ekakkhapena cattāri kiṇṇāni karoti : vaṭṭim jhāpeti andhakāraṃ vidhamati alokaṃ paṭividaṃseti sinehaṃ pariyādiyati, evaṃ eva maggaṃ nānaṃ apubbam acariṃam ekakkhanena cattāri saṅgāni abhisameti dukkhaṃ parinibbhaṃsamayaṇa abhisameti samudayaṃ paṇānābhisamayaṇa abhisameti maggaṃ bhavaṇābhisamayaṇa abhisameti nirodhaṃ sacchikiriyābhisamayaṇa abhisameti. Kim vuttaṃ hoti ? Nirodhaṃ ārambanaṃ karitvā cattāri pi saṅgāni paṇunāti passati paṭivijjhati ti. 15. (1)Vi II 690.

106. Yamhi kālāhi vānanti. 16. (1)Pap I 83.

107. Yasmā taṃsā tathā samāyoge kiṃ bhaṇṇaṃ atthi ti puṇṇāni sabbam atthi ti āhamsu, tasmā taṃ vacanaṃ upādaya savatthi ti vuccati. 17. (1)Pj II 300

108. Yasmā pubbe Mahāpanādam rājakumāraṃ nānā nātakāni
..... so padeso Kosalo ti vuccati ti. 18.

(1)Sum VII I 239 (2)Pap II 326

109. Sadevakaṃ ti devatāhi saddhim avasesaṃ lokaṃ. 19.
(1)Sum VII I 175. (2)Pap II 202 (3)MN I 211

110. Sa ca yasmā saha jātapahāṇ'ekattāhi ettha attho veditabbo. 20. Porāṇānaṃ adhippāyo. 20. (1)Pap I 74.

111. Sujāya diyaṇāyā mahayāgaṃ paṭigāhantānti. 21.
(1)Sum VII I 289.

It is difficult to say whether 29 and 31 are parts of stanzas or whether they are two prose sentences.

Appendix II c

Table showing the Porana quotations in each Commentary.

(The numbers refer to those in Appendix II a & b.)

Visuddhimagga.	...1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10,
	11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19,
	21, 29, 33, 37, 43, 45, 46,
	47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53,
	55, 60, 66, 67, 72, 73, 74,
	75, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88,
	92, 95, 102, 105.
Samantapāsādikā	12, 26, 27, 30, 32, 34, 38, 39,
	44, 55, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65,
	67, 69, 72, 74, 78, 79, 80, 87, 88.
Atthasālinī	42, 95.
Sammohavinodanī	20, 83, 97.
Sumaṅgalavilāsinī	23, 67, 70, 71, 72, 74, 89, 100,
	103, 108, 109, 111.
Papañcasūdanī	9, 20, 23, 36, 67, 70, 71, 72,
	74, 93, 96, 98, 106, 108, 109, 110.
Sāratthappakāsinī	8, 15, 20, 22, 25, 28, 29, 35,
	40, 41, 54, 67, 68, 76, 77, 81, 90.
Manorathapurāṇī	23, 67, 70, 91, 96.
Khuddakapāṭha Attha- kathā.	101, 104.
Udāna	23, 28, 35, 54, 67, 68, 94, 96.

Itivuttaka Atthakatha ..	25,	67,	77.						
Suttanipata ..	31,	99,	101,	107.					
Niddesa ..	20,	23,	31,	43,	60,	67,	70,		
	71,	95,	109.						
Patisahambhidamagga,,	21,	19,	20,	21,	23,	29,	55,		
	67,	70,	71,	72,	74,	82,	88.		
Apadāna ..	24,	56,	57,	58.					
Buddhavamsa ..	67.								
Netti ..	71.								

Appendix II d.

References to, and quotations from, the Porāṇaka theras.

1. Ten'eva Porāṇakattherā : lajjī rakkhissati lajjī rakkhissati ti tikkhattum ahaṃsu. VI.I.99
2. Porāṇakattherā hi anusuyyaka honti, na attano rucim eva uccubhāraṃ viya evaṃ ukkhipitvā vicaranti, kāraṇaṃ eva gāhanti akāraṇaṃ viassaṃjenti. Sum VII III. 745
3. Porāṇakattherā pana evarūpaṃ bhikkhūṃ cūlasotapanno ti vadanti. Pap II.120.
4. Porāṇakattherā atiraschānakathā honti nisinnatthāna paṇṇaṃ ā samutthāpetvā ajānantaṃ puccanti jānantaṃ viassaṃjenti, tena nesaṃ ayaṃ katha udapādi. SA Sn III. 92.
5. Imasmiṃ ca pana Bījopamasutte diṭṭhi ti niyataniocchā-diṭṭhi gahita ti Porāṇakattherā ahaṃsu. Tam pana pakkipitvā sabbāni pi dvāsatthi diṭṭhigatāni gahitāni ti vuttaṃ. Man X II.26
6. Porāṇakattherā pana ettakena pakāṭaṃ na hoti ti vibhajitvā dassesum. SV 314.
7. Porāṇaka bhikkhū kira amhākaṃ upajjhāyo ācariyo ti na mukhaṃ oloketvā vattaṃ karonti, sampattaṃ pariccheden'eva karonti. SV 350.

Appendix III

List of Kings.¹

1. Vijaya	483 - 445 B.C.
Interregnum	445 - 444
2. Panduvāsudeva	444 - 414
3. Abhaya	414 - 394
Interregnum	394 - 377
4. Pandukabhaya	377 - 307
5. Mutasiva	307 - 247
6. Devanampiyatissa	247 - 207
7. Uttiya	207 - 197
8. Mahasiva	197 - 187
9. Suratissa	187 - 177
10. Sena }	177 - 155
11. Gattika }	
12. Asela	155 - 145
13. Elara	145 - 101
14. Dutthagamani	101 - 77
15. Saddhatissa	77 - 59
16. Thulathana	59
17. Lakkhatissa	59 - 50
18. Khalatānaga	50 - 43

1. The dates are based on Cūlavamsa Vol II pp ix-xi

19. Vattagāmaṇi	43
20. Pulahaṭṭha	
21. Bāhiya	
22. Paṇḍamāra	43 - 29
23. Pīlayamāra	
24.	
25. Dāthika	
19.	
25. Vattagāmaṇi	29 - 17
25	
26. Mahācūli Mahātiṣṣa	17 - 3
26	
27. Coranāga	3 B.C. - 9 A.D.
27. Tiṣṣa	9 - 12 A.D.
28. Anulā	12 - 16
29. Kūṭakappatissa	16 - 38
30. Bhāṭikabhaya	38 - 66
31. Mahādāthika Mahānāga	67 - 79
32. Aṇḍagāmaṇi	79 - 89
33. Kapirajāputissa	89 - 92
34. Cūḷabhaya	92 - 93
35. Sivali	93
36. Ilanāga	93 - 103
37. Candamukhasiva	103 - 112
38. Yasalālakatissa	112 - 120
39. Subha	120 - 126
	127
40. Vasaḥha	126 - 171
41. Vankanaṣikatissa	171 - 174
42. Gaḇabāhu	174 - 196

43. Mahallakaraṇa	196 - 202
44. Bhatikatisa	203 - 227
45. Kanitthatissa	227 - 245
46. Krujjanaga	246 - 248
47. Kuficana	248 - 249
48. Sirinaga I	249 - 268
49. Voharikatisa	269 - 291
50. Abhayanaga	291 - 299
51. Sirinaga II	300 - 302
52. Vijayakumara	302 - 303
53. Sanghatissa	303 - 307
54. Sirisanghabodhi	307 - 309
55. Gothabhaya	309 - 322
56. Jetthatissa I	323 - 333
57. Mahāsena	334 - 361
58. Sirimoghavanna	} 362 - 409
59. Jetthatissa II	
60. Buddhadasa	
61. Upatissa I	
62. Mahānāma	409 - 431

Bibliography

Pāli

- Aṅguttaranikāya P.T.S. Edition.
 Apadāna Atthakathā
 (Visuddhañānavilāsinī)... Sinhalese Edition.
 Buddhavaṃsa Atthakathā
 (Madhuraññānavilāsinī)... Hewavitarana (Sinhalese) Ed.
 Cariyāpitaka Atthakathā
 (Paramatthadīpanī)..... Sinh.Ed.
 Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā P.T.S.
 Dīghanikāya..... P.T.S.
 Dīpavaṃsa Edited and translated by Oldenberg.
 Gandhavaṃsa
 London, 1879
 Itivuttaka Atthakathā P.T.S. (Journal 1886)
 Jātakatthakathā
Hewavitarana (Sinh.) Ed.
 Khuddakapāṭha Atthakathā
 Jātakatthakathā Fausbøll's Ed.
 Khuddakapāṭha Atthakathā ...
 (Paramatthajōtikā) P.T.S.
 Mahāvaṃsa P.T.S.
 Majjhimanikāya.....P.T.S.
 Manorathapūraṇī P.T.S.
 ManorathapūraṇīSinh. Ed.
 Milindapaṭṭha Edited by V.Trenckner,
 Royal Asiatic Society,
 London, 1928
 Nettī Atthakathā Hewavitarana (Sinh.)Ed.

- Niddesa Atthakathā
(Saddhammapajjotikā).... Hewavitarana (Sinh.) Ed.
- Pāṭisaṃbhidaṃmagga Atthakathā P.T.S.(Journals)
- Papañcasūdanī P.T.S.
- Papañcasūdanī Sinh.Ed.
- Paṭisaṃbhidaṃmagga Atthakathā
(Saddhammapakkasini).....Hewavitarana (Sinh.)Ed.
- Petavatthu Atthakathā
(Paramatthadīpanī).....P.T.S.
- Samantapāsādikā P.T.S.
- SamantapāsādikāSinh.Ed.
- Sammohavinodanī P.T.S.
- Samyuttanikāya P.T.S.
- Sāratthapakkasini P.T.S.
- Sāratthapakkasini H. Hewavitarana (Sinh.) Ed.
- Sumaṅgalavilāsini P.T.S.
- Sumaṅgalavilāsini Hewavitarana (Sinh.) Ed.
- Suttanipāta P.T.S.
- Suttanipāta Atthakathā
(Paramatthajotikā).....P.T.S.
- Theragāthā Atthakathā
(Paramatthadīpanī).....P.T.S.
- Theragāthā Atthakathā
(Paramatthadīpanī).....Hewavitarana (Sinh.) Ed.
- Therīgāthā Atthakathā
(Paramatthadīpanī).....P.T.S.
- Udāna Atthakathā
(Paramatthadīpanī).....P.T.S.
- Vināyavattu Atthakathā
(Paramatthadīpanī)..... P.T.S.

Vinaya Oldenberg's Edition.

Visuddhinagga P.T.S.

Sanskrit

Mahāvastu Edited by E. Senart, Paris,
Paris, 1882-1897

Sinhalese

Nikāyaśāgraha Colombo, 1922

English Translations.

Beginnings of Buddhist Art

and other Essays by

A. Foucher Translated by L.A. Thomas and F.W.

Thomas. Humphrey Milford,
London, 1917

Buddhist Manual of
Psychological Ethics.

Translated by Mrs. G.A.F. Rhys Davids
Royal Asiatic Society,
London, 1923

Buddhist Records of the
Western World.

Translated by Samuel Beal.
Trübner, London, 1884

Ulavansa.

Translated by W. Geiger
P.T.S. London

Dipavansa.

Translated by H. Oldenberg.
London, 1879

Dipavansa and Mahāvansa
by W.Geiger.

The Expositor.

Fa Hien's Records of
Buddhist Kingdoms.
Hundred Sayings
Mahāvansa.

Minor Anthologies of the
Pali Canon.

Path of Purity .

Points of Controversy
Travels of Buddhist
Pilgrims.

Travels of Fa Hien

Translated by E.M.Coomaraswamy
Colombo, 1908

Translated by P.Maung Tin
P.T.S. London.

Translated by James Legge
Oxford, 1886

Translated by F.L. Woodward. P.T.S. London
Translated by W.Geiger
P.T.S. London

Translated by Mrs Rhys Davids
Oxford Univ.Press, 1931

Translated by P.Maung Tin
P.T.S. London

Translated by S.2. Augund M^{rs} Rhys Davids
Translated by S.Beal , *P.T.S. London*
Trübner, London 1869

Translated by H.A.Giles
Cambridge Univ. Press. 1923

English

American Lectures on Buddhism -T.W.Rhys Davids.

Buddhist India.

Book of Ceylon .
Ceylon.

Early Buddhist Monachism

Putnam & Sons, London 1896

T.W.Rhys Davids.

Fisher Unwin Ltd. London
H.W.Cave , Cassel & Co.Lond.1908
J.E.Tennent, Lond. 1859

S.Dutt. Kegan Paul,
Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner
& Co. Lond. 1924

Hinduism and Buddhism

Sir Charles Eliot.

Edward Arnold & Co. Lond. 1921

History of pre-Buddhist

B.M. Barua.

Indian Philosophy

Calcutta Univ. 1921

Index to Mahāvamsa

J. Steele. Colombo. 1907

Life of Buddha as Legend

E.J. Thomas.

and History

Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner

& Co. Lond. 1927

Life and Work of

B.C. Law.

Buddhaghosa

Thacker, Spink & Co. Calcutta,
1923Mahabodhi or the Great
Buddhist Temple under
the Bodhi Tree at
Buddha-gaya.

A. Cunningham.

W.H. Allen & Co.
London 1892*Mahāyāna in Ceylon*
Pāli Literature of Ceylon*S. Paranavitana. Colombo 1928*
G.P. Malalasekara.Royal Asiatic Society,
London. 1928

Ruined Cities of Ceylon

H.W. Cave. Lond. 1897

A Short History of Ceylon

H.W. Codrington.

Macmillan & Co. Lond. 1926

Spread of Buddhism and

N. Dutt.

Buddhist Schools

Luzac & Co. London.

GermanDie Kosmographie der Inder
India and Buddha
Pāli Literatur und Sprache

W. Kirfel.

Leipzig. 1920

E. Windisch

Leipzig 1895

W. Geiger.

Strassburg. 1916

Visuddhimagga (German

Translation)

Nyānātīlaka. Munich. 1931

Journals and other Publications. ---

Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

Catalogue of the Chinese Tripitaka, by E. H. Johnston.

**Catalogue of the Sinhalese Manuscripts in the British Museum,
by D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe.**

Ceylon Documents in the Public Record Office, London.

Encyclopaedia Britannica.

Epigraph Zeylanica.

Hasting Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.

Indian Historical Quarterly.

Journal of the Pali Text Society, London.

**Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and
Ireland.**

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Ceylon Branch.

**Pali-English Dictionary (of the Pali Text Society).
in
Sanskrit-English Dictionary by Monier Williams.**